

SOUTH CAROLINA

Coit M. Graves, Pageland.

TEXAS

Robert C. Dooley, Justin.

VERMONT

Thomas J. Fitzgerald, Bellows Falls.
Michael C. Mulcahy, Brandon.
Foster C. Parmenter, Chester.
Jeremiah C. Durick, Fair Haven.
Oscar N. Campbell, Hyde Park.
John J. Rock, Ludlow.
Carroll E. Jenkins, Orleans.
Martha G. Kibby, Randolph Center.
Daniel F. Aher, Springfield.
Irene F. Smith, Waitsfield.
Clinton M. Hall, Wilmington.

VIRGINIA

Isaac C. Taylor, Big Stone Gap.
Florence T. Beans, Round Hill.

WASHINGTON

Marie L. Wenberg, East Stanwood.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. RAYBURN].

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the way, the truth, and the life, we laud and magnify Thy glorious name. O Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us; in Thee power, love, and compassion are eternal and everlasting. Let Thy holy hand be laid upon us; blend the discords of our natures into heaven's harmony and soften the tears of repentance into psalms of victory. O Thou Christ, do Thou still call across the centuries to heartsore humanity; Come unto Me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Oh, come and let hunger-bitten lips be fed, chilled bodies be clothed; come, and may the stranger be received, the sick visited, and thus weave for our immortal souls robes of righteousness that our blessed Lord and His saints will approve. In the name of Jesus Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1157. An act for the relief of Roy D. Cook, a minor.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7805) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the Military and Naval Establishments, Coast Guard, and Federal Bureau of Investigation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendment No. 5 to the bill (H. R. 8067) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution:

Senate Resolution 228

FEBRUARY 6, 1940.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. CASSIUS C. DOWELL, late a Representative from the State of Iowa.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative the Senate do now adjourn.

Pursuant to the foregoing the Vice President appointed Mr. GILLETTE and Mr. HERRING as members of said committee on the part of the Senate.

Mr. DOUGHTON assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, our able and beloved Speaker is unable to be present, as he is suffering from a slight case of influenza. He is confined to his bed and the House physician forbids his coming to the sessions of the House. I am happy to say that he is improving and the doctor is confident he will be able to return to his duties within a few days.

The Speaker could designate a Speaker pro tempore, but if he did so, some question could arise as to the authority of the Speaker pro tempore to appoint conference committees and sign enrolled bills. There will be ready for signature several enrolled bills today and tomorrow, and it is necessary that they be promptly signed so that they may be transmitted to the President.

In order that this may be accomplished, I shall offer a privileged resolution, and in connection with this I may say that the procedure has the concurrence of the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 377

Resolved, That Hon. SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas, be, and he is hereby, elected Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

Resolved, That the President and the Senate be notified by the Clerk of the election of Hon. SAM RAYBURN as Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. RAYBURN resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore and the oath of office was administered by Mr. McCORMACK.

DOMICILE OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF VETERANS' BUREAU

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. COCHRAN was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a letter from General Hines and brief quotations from the hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill.)

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, Members are continually calling the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments requesting information concerning bills which have been introduced which have for their purpose eliminating the Veterans' Bureau regulations whereby employees are required to be domiciled at the facility where they are employed, or, stating it more plainly, the charges for quarters, subsistence, and laundry, regardless as to whether or not the employee accepts the service.

It has been pointed out, and very properly so, that this works a severe hardship on the personnel, especially those who are married and whose families live close to the facility.

When the independent offices appropriation bill was under consideration by the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, the Administrator, was questioned at length on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks that part of the hearings which I refer to:

ADJUSTMENT IN CHARGES FOR QUARTERS, SUBSISTENCE, AND LAUNDRY FOR ORDERLIES AND ATTENDANTS

Mr. WOODRUM. You will recall in the hearings last year that the question of adjustments in the charges for quarters, subsistence, and laundry for field employees was discussed. Have you been able to work out any satisfactory plan for relieving employees from these charges, as I notice that you have not requested any funds for this specific purpose in your 1941 budget.

General HINES. We had up with the Budget the proposition of Q. S. and L. We did not include it in our estimates. We submitted a statement on that subject alone, and with the committee's permission I would like to make some reference to that statement in order that the data may be correct.

First—before I take this up—I had a feeling that when the 8-hour day was put into effect, we would be in a better position definitely to determine the personnel that had to be at the station at the time meals were served.

In other words, the hours run generally from 7 to 3; from 3 for the next 8 hours; and then the midnight shift. During that period those that are serving when one meal is served, in my judgment, should pay for only one meal. Those are serving hours when two meals are served, necessarily cannot leave their duty to go and get meals. Their work is right there. The mealtime is limited. Those that are living off the station certainly could not go and get back within a half hour allowed for the noonday meal.

I thoroughly believe in the fairness of only charging them for the meals served during the period they are there; they can take them and eventually we will have to adjust this matter before complaints subside in that respect.

I think the Budget, after we had presented this statement, felt that I should endeavor within the funds allowed to see how far I could go, because they did not include any new money for that.

Mr. WOODRUM. We gave you \$2,000,000 a year or two ago for that specific purpose, did we not?

General HINES. Yes. In the appropriation for the fiscal year 1937 we were allowed \$2,000,000 which permitted us to partially place this program into effect by allowing certain deserving married employees or those with dependents who were then required to take quarters, subsistence, and laundry to be relieved from these charges and live off the stations.

Mr. WOODRUM. There has been such persistent complaint about that that I think it ought to be done. I do not think you can justify, nor can the Government justify, taking a man who lives at home, who does not have to take his meals out, or lives on the station, and take out of his wages money for those meals. In some cases it reduces the wages to less than \$70 a month, on which a man with a family would find it difficult to live. I do not think we can stand up and defend that. I do not think I can do it any longer.

Mr. CASE. I think the chairman is absolutely right about that.

General HINES. Let me present to you what I presented to the Budget.

"In connection with our budget estimate for salaries during the fiscal year 1941, I desire at this point to discuss a problem with which this Administration is presently faced, namely, the deductions now made from the salaries of certain employees for allowances furnished, particularly that for subsistence. Under our present policy incumbents of certain types of positions are considered foodhandlers and their appointment on a salary plus subsistence basis is mandatory. Included in this group are nurses, dietitians, cooks, mess and hospital attendants.

"We have had numerous appeals during the past few years from certain of these employees living off the hospital reservations, from whose salary full subsistence is deducted notwithstanding the fact that they do not partake of three meals per day, as they are off duty during one or more meal periods daily."

Mr. CASE. At that point, has not subsistence also been charged against them during the time that they have been on leave or on vacation?

General HINES. We have taken that into account by figuring that into the total number of days and arriving at the rate charged. It looks as though they are charged for that, but that is taken into account in fixing the rate.

Mr. CASE. I recognize that that is true, but they do not understand that.

General HINES. I know that.

Mr. CASE. I have been hounded by friends of employees who say, "How can you possibly justify charging them for subsistence during the 2 weeks or the month that they may be on leave?"

General HINES. That is true, but at the same time they went into that and took it into account. But I fully agree with you that it is a difficult position to defend because it does appear that they are being charged. In reality the rate was fixed with that in view. To continue my quotation:

"The inauguration of the 8-hour day has further increased the number of employees so affected. Recently this problem has become more aggravated and there has been rather widespread agitation for an adjustment of our policy and I have been advised, by sources believed to be reliable, that the Appropriations Subcommittee will give serious consideration toward providing additional funds for this purpose unless the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget take appropriate action. I would much prefer that this be worked out as an administrative measure rather than as the result of congressional legislation which, I believe, would be too broad in its application."

I think there is that danger on the floor. I am not talking now about the committee, but I believe that if an attempt were made to put an amendment in, it would go through.

"It is estimated that there would be approximately 8,451 employees affected by this adjustment in the 1941 fiscal year. Based on a minimum average of \$270 per annum for subsistence, this would require an additional \$2,281,770. It is proposed, however, to make mandatory the acceptance of such meals as are served during the work period of the group of employees involved for which payment will be made, for individual meals served. To compute the

approximate amount which would be obtained in this manner, it is estimated that this number of employees would average one meal per day at the rate of \$90 per annum for 11 months each year, which allows for annual leave, and totals approximately \$697,000. It is anticipated that the number of employees who would partake of two meals per day would be offset by those on sick leave or off duty on Sundays and holidays. This last-named amount, representing refunds, must under present law be deposited into 'Miscellaneous receipts, Treasury Department,' which would not aid our appropriation.

"Through the adoption of the above procedure there is another potential saving which would assist in reducing the estimated cost of \$2,281,770. The reduction in the number of meals or rations served to these employees should result in some saving in the cost of raw food purchased. I am somewhat dubious as to whether this cost would be reduced in direct proportion to the reduction in the number of meals served this group of employees, but I am, however, estimating a saving of \$700,000 on this basis.

"In view of the above calculations, it appears that this adjustment in the deductions now made from the salaries of employees for subsistence who are not residing on the respective field station would require \$1,500,000 in addition to the amount requested for salaries in the 1941 Budget estimate."

Mr. WOODRUM. On that basis, that would not go into operation until July, would it?

General HINES. That is right, unless you made it immediately available.

Mr. WOODRUM. How much money would you have to have to put that into effect January 1?

General HINES. We feel the amount we suggested to the Budget, \$1,500,000.

Mr. WOODRUM. What about the rest of this year?

General HINES. That is a full year. The rest of this year would be half of that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Seven or eight hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. WOODRUM. General, I think I am speaking the unanimous opinion of this committee when I say that I would like to see that done. I think I can say that if it means a deficit, this committee would back you up. If there is any gentleman of the committee that does not agree with that statement, I would like to have him express himself.

General HINES. I am willing to undertake it, and with that understanding we would not have to have this appropriation immediately.

Mr. WOODRUM. Would you need any language in the legislation?

General HINES. No.

Mr. WOODRUM. You can handle it administratively?

General HINES. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOODRUM. We have the understanding, then, that in the next fiscal year you will put in this plan that you speak of, and the committee will take care of a deficit if it is made necessary.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There will still be \$90 a year taken out of that, will there not?

General HINES. I cannot see how we can escape that. I cannot understand how a man would leave and go home to get a noonday meal.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What would that average per meal, approximately?

General HINES. About 26 cents.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is quite reasonable.

Mr. STARNES. It would seem he would be foolish to go home, at that.

General HINES. If the Government makes any money on meals it would be the first time it has done it.

I will start putting this into effect this fiscal year, provided I can find the money with which to do it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say I have discussed this question with General Hines on numerous occasions, as I am heartily in sympathy with the effort being made to correct this situation which cannot be defended. This morning I received a letter from General Hines on the subject, which I will insert in the RECORD. The letter follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, February 6, 1940.

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. COCHRAN: Reference is made to our recent conference, when we discussed the question of quarters, subsistence, and laundry for employees engaged at our various field facilities.

The optional feature of allowances has been given a great deal of study by the Veterans' Administration in connection with its efforts to institute policies and promulgate instructions which have for their purpose the improvement of employment conditions. Our objective is to provide that allowances be optional to the extent that the needs of the service permit. On the other hand, the question of acceptance of quarters by employees is not peculiar to facilities of the Veterans' Administration. The nature of our operations has caused provision to be made for quartering employees on the station and also for providing for other allowances, subsistence, and laundry. These requirements are understood by employees at the time of employment; notwithstanding, relief is afforded whenever possible. The maximum that may be accomplished, however, must accord with the requirements of the service and with available funds.

A policy placed into effect June 1, 1939, provided for relief from quarters charges in the cases of those employees assigned to non-

housekeeping quarters, who maintain homes in the vicinity of the station for persons wholly dependent upon them for support. For those in certain positions, however, 40 percent are required to have quarters assigned. According to the policy previously in effect, 50 percent of the employees had been subject to this requirement. Those classified as food handlers, however, have not to date been relieved of the charge for subsistence. At this time consideration is being given to making adjustments in charges for subsistence; that is, study is being made at representative stations to determine the extent of adjustments necessary in applying a policy of charging for subsistence to those living off the station only on the basis of meals served during their tour of duty.

In this connection I desire to invite your attention to the statement I made before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives at the time hearings were being held on the independent offices appropriation bill for 1941, when this subject was discussed in some detail (pp. 611, 612, 613, and 614). I stated, among other things, that our tentative plan involved an amount approximating \$1,500,000 per annum and that it would be made effective during this fiscal year, provided funds could be made available from our regular appropriation. As to the fiscal year 1941, it will be my purpose to have further consideration given the matter by the Bureau of the Budget, and it is probable that I will discuss it with the President.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES, Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Jacob Baker, representing the United Federal Workers, appeared before the committee he brought up the question. In view of General Hines' testimony the point at issue was quickly disposed of. I quote from the hearings:

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I wish to talk very briefly about one particular item in connection with the Veterans' Administration that I imagine is recurrently familiar to all members of this committee. The situation, however, still exists. It concerns a charge made for quarters, subsistence, and laundry—Q. S. and L.—to a great many people who work in the Veterans' Administration who are unable to avail themselves of the service. I might take just a moment as to the history of this matter.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not want to anticipate you, but we have a definite commitment from General Hines, in these hearings, that that is going to be eliminated entirely.

Mr. BAKER. That is splendid.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The only charge made will be for one meal where the employee is working during the day and has to be there for lunch.

Mr. BAKER. That is very splendid.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And I think he said that the charge would be only 25 cents.

Mr. BAKER. That is fine. That actually does relieve the whole situation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope General Hines will not delay in correcting the situation complained of. There seems no necessity for reporting the bill referred to, but I can assure the membership of the House the committee will act if it later develops action is necessary.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 378

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing committees of the House of Representatives, to wit:

Interstate and Foreign Commerce: RUDOLPH G. TENEROWICZ, Michigan.

Merchant Marine and Fisheries: MICHAEL J. KENNEDY, New York.

Post Offices and Post Roads: PIUS L. SCHWERT, New York.

World War Veterans' Legislation: ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP, Georgia.

Insular Affairs: JOHN EDWARD SHERIDAN, Pennsylvania.

Territories: JOHN EDWARD SHERIDAN, Pennsylvania.

Civil Service: JOHN EDWARD SHERIDAN, Pennsylvania.

District of Columbia: MICHAEL J. KENNEDY, New York.

Census: MICHAEL J. KENNEDY, New York; JOSEPH R. BRYSON, South Carolina; ED GOSSETT, Texas.

The resolution was agreed to.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The Chair laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

FEBRUARY 8, 1940.

The Honorable WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I wish to submit herewith my resignation as a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL J. KENNEDY.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The Chair laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

FEBRUARY 7, 1940.

The Honorable WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Having been selected for membership on the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads, I hereby respectfully submit my resignation from the other committees of which I am at present a member, namely, Census, District of Columbia, Expenditures in the Executive Departments, War Claims, and World War Veterans' Legislation.

Very truly yours,

PIUS L. SCHWERT.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a very brief communication.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a very short editorial on the subject of taxes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS]?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND CREDIT MARKET

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to establish an international trade and credit market based on gold for the purpose of circulating and maintaining gold values and to promote trade with Latin America.

The main objective of this bill is to take some of the buried gold out of the ground in Kentucky and put it to work for the American people. It is becoming more and more obvious that if we continue to monopolize and hoard the gold supply of the world it may cease to have international value.

In that case the American taxpayers would be holding the bag to the extent of \$12,000,000,000, an amount equal to the World War debts.

The time has come for a constructive program to save the American people from being mulcted and robbed by foreign gold-producing nations. We have set up a golden calf to worship, which is of no more use to us than the one destroyed by Moses.

The New Deal has blundered blindly into a golden trap of its own setting and has been unable to free itself from its evil consequences. If we continue this mad policy of accumulating gold, such nations as Germany, Italy, and Japan, and other non-gold-producing countries, will say "We can get along on managed currency, and you can keep your buried gold."

My proposal, worked out by Mr. Wolstan Crocker Brown, former monetary adviser to the Republican National Committee, aims primarily to sustain the balance of gold by creating a credit market for exports and imports with Latin America. The plan does not permit the export of gold, but ought to be the means of increasing our trade with Latin America substantially. [Applause.]

AMERICAN FAR EASTERN POLICY

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Japan has had more than 6 months in which to contemplate the termination of a 29-year-old commercial treaty which, after notice to her, expired on January 26, 1940.

The present Sino-Japanese war began on July 7, 1937. Nine days later Secretary Hull issued a broad declaration of the fundamental principles of American foreign policy, and thus Japan has had nearly 3 years to consider the effect of her continued violation of American rights and legitimate interests in China. To date there is no cessation of these acts. On the contrary, the events of each day disclose a continuing and consistent disregard of those treaties and agreements voluntarily entered into by Japan and designed to safeguard national sovereignty and equality of economic opportunity.

I have observed that when the people of this country possess the facts public opinion forms swiftly—and usually it is sound. It is amazing how people here in America have patiently and understandingly followed the long sequel of events leading up to the present state of affairs in the Far East. Beginning with the Nine Power Treaty, signed here at Washington in February of 1922, with Japan a party, Americans have step by step traced developments in Asia until today public opinion, the keystone of this Government, is overwhelmingly in agreement with Mr. John Hay and demands that China be permitted through natural evolutionary processes to gain her liberation. They are taking the long view of the situation, and they are convinced that we are "sowing the wind," in lending our money, our industry, and our political influence to the uses of Japan.

Mr. Speaker, impetuosity has not led them to this conclusion, nor has prejudice played a part. It is a sober judgment of a people who have never condoned tyranny nor failed to indict injustice. A momentous issue of right and wrong confronts the people of America. Shall we continue to be partners with Japan in her unjustifiable invasion of China or shall we refuse henceforth to furnish Japan with materials of war? The time has come for this country to make its decision whether it will give further aid and encouragement to this aggressor. I have an abiding conviction that many of my colleagues voted for the Neutrality Act last year because its intent and purpose was favorable to the nonaggressor nations of Europe. We shall have to decide whether or not our course in Asia in the immediate future shall be for or against the nonaggressor nations. Every Member of this body realized many months ago that when we forsook the application of the time-honored international law in our relationship with the nations of the earth we bade consistency farewell. We have deliberately embarked upon a foreign policy through which we shall henceforth endeavor to search out equity and justice in each problem with which we are confronted, and to make those decisions thereunder which smack not of pious platitudes, but, on the contrary, reflect our determination of finding ways and means to convince the world that this country will not tolerate the aggression of the lawless.

The trend of events in the Orient would have tried the patience of a Job. Americans everywhere have borne, with no small degree, our forbearance with the policies of Japan in China until he who runs may read that Japan has embraced the war philosophy of Germany and Russia. If there is doubt as to this, I refer the House to the following statement from the Japanese War Office. It is that country's definition of what war is:

War is the father of creation and the mother of culture. Rivalry for supremacy does for the state what struggling against adversity does for the individual. It is such impetus, in the one case, as in the other, that prompts the birth and development of life and cultural creation.

I venture to make this prophesy that unless the United States deals swiftly and resolutely with Japan we shall have to endure the chicanery and artful dodging which characterized those familiar events leading up to Munich.

Mr. Speaker, there is every reason that this country should deal promptly with this question. Americans will not exhibit

the same degree of forbearance which the British Foreign Office exemplified in its dealings with Hitler. Let us review briefly the successive events in Asia:

First. We laid the cornerstone of American far eastern policy in February 1922 with the signing of the Nine-Power Treaty. Japan was a party to that treaty and solemnly agreed to respect the sovereignty and independence of China, to provide the fullest opportunity for China to develop and maintain herself, to refrain from taking advantage of conditions in China in order to seek special rights and privileges which would abridge the rights of the Chinese and citizens of friendly states.

Second. In September 1931 Japan invaded Manchuria. The League of Nations and the United States considered possible action.

Third. The then Secretary of State, Mr. Stimson, announced the doctrine of nonrecognition, which was concurred in by resolution passed by the League of Nations in 1932.

Fourth. Five years pass and the Sino-Japanese War begins in July of 1937. Mr. Cordell Hull issues a broad declaration of the fundamental principles of American foreign policy, which was communicated to Japan.

Fifth. One month later Mr. Hull issues a public statement reaffirming the previous declaration.

Sixth. One month later China appeals to the League of Nations. The League recommended aid to China.

Seventh. One month later Secretary Hull issues a statement in which the Department of State takes the position that the action of Japan in China is inconsistent with the principles which should govern the relationships between nations and is contrary to the provisions of the Nine Power Treaty of 1922. Thus we named Japan the aggressor.

Eighth. Immediately Japan replies and says, we are not breaking any treaty, we are just trying to get China to abandon her anti-Japanese policy.

Ninth. Approximately another month passes. It is November 1937, and a conference has been called at Brussels with the approval of this country. Nineteen nations attend, among them the United States. Japan does not attend, instead she sends a message that her action in China is purely one of self-defense and especially because of the provocative action of China in resorting to force of arms.

Tenth. One month later Japanese military aircraft bombed and sank the U. S. S. *Panay*; 2 days thereafter the Japanese Government expressed regret, admitted responsibility, and offered amends.

Eleventh. One month later our Ambassador, Mr. Grew, is writing notes to the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs protesting and demanding that the disregard of American property rights and disrespect for the flag cease.

Twelfth. One month later the Japanese Minister Hirota writes our Ambassador that this Government is studying how they can elaborate effective and adequate measures that as soon as possible may put a definite stop to the occurrence of similar events.

Meantime the bombing of civilians goes on in China and Acting Secretary Welles in June of 1938 pens a note to the Japanese Government reiterating this Government's reprobation of ruthless bombing of unfortified localities with the resultant slaughter of women and children, and characterized such methods as barbarous.

In November the world is treated to a rather remarkable document. It is a note from the Japanese Minister to Mr. Grew in which Japan proclaims a "new order" in the Orient.

We are told that Japan at present is devoting her energies to the establishment of a new order based on genuine international justice throughout east Asia, the attainment of which end is not only an indispensable condition to the very existence of Japan, but also constitutes the foundation of an enduring peace and the stability of east Asia. Apparently this new order is to grow out of the benevolent usages of explosives and implements of war in the hands of a ruthless invader.

The American Ambassador in a note to the Japanese Minister in December of 1938 rejected Japan's new order, and

stated to the Japanese Government that the United States is well aware that many of the changes in China have been brought about by action by Japan, and that this Government does not admit that there is need or warrant for any one power to take upon itself to prescribe what shall be the terms and conditions of a new order in areas not under its sovereignty, and to constitute itself the repository of authority and the agent of destiny. Following this note no noticeable change in Japanese policy has been made in China. In October of 1939, Mr. Grew, in an address before the America-Japan Society in Tokyo, informed the Japanese people that Americans believe that an effort is being made to establish control, in Japan's own interest, of large areas on the continent of Asia, and to impose upon these areas a system of closed economy. He likewise informed the Japanese people that Americans have been profoundly shocked over the bombing in China not only on the grounds of humanity but also on the grounds of direct menace to American lives and property, and the interference with American rights by Japanese armed forces in utter disregard of treaties and agreements existing between the two countries.

One other event has transpired since October, and that was the expiration of the trade treaty in January of this year. It may be, Mr. Speaker, that the Japanese Government now occupies an anxious seat as indicated by Ambassador Hironouchi's inquiry no longer than this week as to whether or not after January 26 there will be any change in American duties and tonnage rates now imposed upon Japanese imports, and secondly, whether there is any possibility of an exchange of notes between the two Governments defining immediately the future status of trade relations, and lastly, what will be the position of Japanese merchants who have been doing business in the United States under the old treaty's provisions. It would appear that the policy of this Government at the moment is that our trade relations with Japan will remain on a day-to-day basis, but that does not suffice if the day-to-day basis permits the continued sale of scrap iron and other munitions of war to this aggressor nation.

As an illustration of the willful, headlong course of Japan, I refer the membership of this House to its last act to date. The French-owned railroad from Indochina to Yunnan Province is about the last remaining medium over which American exports to and imports from China can pass without first asking the permission of Japan. Within the past week representatives of this Government have pointed out to Tokyo the harmful effect upon American trade with China of the continued bombing of this railroad by Japanese planes. The Japanese Government has not paid the slightest attention to our request.

Then, again, according to the latest news bulletins, a recent sale of 300,000 bushels of wheat has been made to Japan carrying a 30-cents-a-bushel United States Government subsidy. Can it be possible that while the State Department is doing all that it can to bolster a "moral embargo" on airplanes and bombs, the Department of Agriculture is going about the business of filling the stomachs of the pilots of those bombers?

These things have happened since or at about the time of the expiration of our trade treaty with Japan. And they evidence a Japan so far unimpressed either with the representations or protests of our State Department. The Japanese mind is quick to discern these inconsistencies and to note our willingness to go on protesting from month to month. The Congress wishes to move with care and caution in its consideration of this matter—it does not wish to impede or embarrass the State Department in the handling of this problem, but I believe I express the thoughts of the great majority of my colleagues when I say we have a real stake in the Orient, and we cannot afford to shut our eyes to the possibility of a great Japanese Empire stretching away from Siberia to Singapore.

It is highly significant that Japan should continue now to ignore our protests.

Pending in the Congress are at least four bills proposing to prohibit the export by us to Japan of arms, munitions, and the raw materials out of which they are manufac-

tured. Let the State Department deal with this matter if it can. Negotiation will not accomplish the desired results; we have been negotiating since 1922. We are unwittingly fattening the war lords of Japan at the expense of the Japanese people themselves. We are the fabricators of a Japanese menace—a menace built upon American exports. Day by day we build the Japanese Navy and then hunt anxiously for the millions of dollars necessary to build our own battleships to defend our shores.

I believe it to be the wish of the House that the State Department shall inform the Japanese Government of what is expected henceforth of it, and that this should be done early enough in the present session for the State Department to derive the full benefit of legislative action if necessary. Already there is every sign that the Japanese regard our bark as much worse than our bite. Without a more positive American policy, at least to the extent of withholding economic aid to Japan, the present conflict will rage for years. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KITCHENS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including therein a letter to me from the Secretary of State, Hon. Cordell Hull, on the subject of trade agreements and the woolen industry, and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including therein a letter to me from R. G. Phillips, secretary of the International Apple Association, on the subject of trade agreements and the fresh-fruit industry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Secretary of Commerce Hopkins in reply to a letter from Senator TOBEY.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two letters, one written by me and one written to me, on the subject of the Negro's part in American history.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Elections No. 2 may be permitted to sit today during the sessions of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from New York if that is agreeable to the minority members of the committee.

Mr. GAVAGAN. Yes; it is agreeable to all the members, majority and minority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I find that the material I attempted to insert in the RECORD yesterday regarding the National Youth Administration and its work at the University of Minnesota amounts to four and one-half pages. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD, notwithstanding the fact that this exceeds the regular limit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The material does not consist of editorials or magazine articles?

Mr. ALEXANDER. No; it is a report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELOSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include

therein quotations from the letters of Benjamin Franklin and from the daily papers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

UTOPIA IS IN MINNESOTA

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we heard from the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] that South Dakota is a sunshine State. Of course, no one disagrees with the gentleman's statement. However, we have just as fine sunshine in Minnesota, and in addition to that we have 10,000 lakes. We have also suspected for a long time that we have Utopia there, but we have never had exact and definite proof of it before, until we found out that we have a village there that is a veritable Utopia.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I hold in my hand a very unusual story. It is unusual because it is about a village in my congressional district in Minnesota in which there are no debts, no taxes, and nobody is on relief. Think of it—no debts, taxes, or relief. Can anyone anywhere else in the United States equal that record? Or shall we challenge the whole world?

The village is Long Lake. It is located on one of the most picturesque of Minnesota's 10,000 beautiful lakes and is only a step over the ridge from world-famed Minnetonka, the lake whose sky-blue waters have been made famous in song and verse and Indian legend.

Mr. RANKIN. Any property? Anybody live there?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I have in my hand pictures of the village. It is a very beautiful village, located on one of the most beautiful of our 10,000 lakes. These pictures, here attached to this news article, are of the business district, and of the mayor, W. L. Hursh; of Kenneth Bollum, bank cashier and village clerk; William Bottean, feed-store operator and village trustee; Ross J. Johnston, village council member; "Kipp" Hale, owner of the Buckhorn cafe, and of D. J. Albee, grocer and village trustee, who are all real flesh-and-blood people and who are responsible for this village's excellent condition of affairs.

A short time ago Kenneth Bollum, the village clerk, made the assertion in a public meeting which I attended, that there was no depression, and that business in Long Lake was very good. Read the following article and you will get some idea of what he evidently had in mind.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record and include therein the article which accompanies these pictures.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to know if that is one of the Government-constructed villages.

Mr. ALEXANDER. No. It is the result of natural growth.

Mr. RICH. I did not think it was.

Mr. ALEXANDER. This village needs no help from the Government.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman if the village to which he refers is Hibbing, Minn.?

Mr. ALEXANDER. This is Long Lake, Minn., and it is located in my congressional district.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is that on the Mesabe Iron Range?

Mr. ALEXANDER. No; it is just outside of Minneapolis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

NO DEBT, NO TAXES, NOBODY ON RELIEF—SOUNDS LIKE UTOPIA; IT'S LONG LAKE, MINN.

(By Lewis C. Mills, Star-Journal Staff Writer)

Listen, you property owners, clutching your tax statements in one hand and a crying towel in the other—

There is a municipality in Hennepin County, Minn., within a 30-minute drive of Minneapolis, where there are no local taxes.

There has been no local levy for 5 years.

Although the village has been incorporated for over 30 years it has no debt and there never has been a bond issue.

There is no public relief.

The village council actually takes in more money than it can spend, and members now are mulling over a plan to eliminate school district, county, and State taxes.

Eventually they even may be able to pay residents a small amount for living there.

Hold on there, now—there can't be any such place.

I didn't think so, either, until I talked with W. L. Hursh, Minneapolis attorney and president of the Long Lake council.

Long Lake is a village of some 250, situated 16 miles west of Minneapolis.

According to Mr. Hursh, it is a typical Minnesota village in all respects except its freedom from debt and taxes.

He claims further that any village could eliminate location taxation by the simple process of spending no more than it takes in.

The trouble with most other municipalities is that they also have a relief problem.

There is no relief problem in Long Lake.

"We have had some people who thought the village should support them," Mr. Hursh said, "but we always have been able to find some responsible relative or some other method of taking care of them."

Long Lake receives no aid from the county, State, or Federal Governments; there is no distribution of surplus commodities and no W. P. A. or P. W. A. work.

Now for the plan to eliminate all taxes.

This is a sort of delicate subject, because the plan involves the Long Lake municipal liquor store—and Mr. Hursh is a dry.

The people voted slightly over 2 years ago to have liquor in the village, and a municipal liquor store has been operating since March 6, 1938.

From then to December 31, 1939, the liquor store showed a net profit of \$6,500—more cash money than the village had handled in 5 or 6 ordinary years.

One proposal is for the village to buy up all the property in town, thus removing it from the tax rolls, but permitting the original owners to continue to occupy the property as caretakers. That would eliminate all property taxes.

Then, as the surplus continued to accumulate, each "caretaker" might be paid a reasonable sum for "looking after" the village property.

It sounds silly, and the village probably won't do it, but Mr. Hursh insists County Auditor Al Erickson has been unable to find any flaw in the plan.

Mr. Hursh salves his dry conscience with the comment that the liquor store is patronized principally by visitors from Minneapolis or tourists passing through.

RECORD COLD WEATHER IN MISSISSIPPI

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I suppose the gentleman is now going to give us some information about the power rates?

Mr. RANKIN. I will do that a little later; I am saving that for another address. I will show the gentleman then what the T. V. A. and the R. E. A. are doing for the people of the country.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman going to talk about that picket line the gentleman and I go through every day?

Mr. RANKIN. I am going to hear the gentleman from Michigan on it first.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield, so I can be heard now?

Mr. RANKIN. No; I will not yield now. The gentleman can speak later.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we have had two speeches in the last 2 days about the weather, one from the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and one from the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ALEXANDER]. It seems to me the normal weather, in both South Dakota and Minnesota, has disappeared, and I am going to tell you what has become of it. It went down to Mississippi for the time being. We are now ready to return it with interest.

My home district has been under a sheet of snow ranging from 9 to 24 inches deep and the thermometer has been below zero. I had a letter this morning from a friend of mine at Macon, Miss., which is in latitude 33°, who said that they had had a 24-inch snow and that the thermometer went to 11°

below zero. In my home town of Tupelo, Miss., this Minnesota weather that has escaped from that State, and from South Dakota, took the thermometer 14° below zero, which is the coldest in all history. In 1887 the thermometer went to 11° below zero at Tupelo, and in 1899 it went to 11° below zero, but this is the first time it has ever reached as low as 14° below zero. In 1887 there was no snow with the zero weather, and in 1899 there was only 3 or 4 inches of snow. This time the snow ranged from about 9 inches at Tupelo to 24 inches at Macon.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a schedule showing the temperature at Aberdeen, Miss., which is also in my district, for the entire month of January 1940.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I say to the gentleman that it will be perfectly all right to return the cold weather if the gentleman will send along the 24 inches of snow?

Mr. RANKIN. I would be glad to send both, I will say to the gentleman from South Dakota, for we have an ample rainfall in that area and do not need the extra moisture, as they do in South Dakota.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, you will note from the following temperature readings, taken from the Aberdeen Examiner, that the thermometer never got above the freezing point at Aberdeen, Miss., during the entire month of January, which I am sure is a record for that locality for all time.

Those readings are as follows:

Jan. 1.....	32 above
Jan. 2.....	20 above
Jan. 3.....	16 above
Jan. 4.....	24 above
Jan. 5.....	28 above
Jan. 6.....	19 above
Jan. 7.....	32 above
Jan. 8.....	30 above
Jan. 9.....	19 above
Jan. 10.....	32 above
Jan. 11.....	32 above
Jan. 12.....	32 above
Jan. 13.....	32 above
Jan. 14.....	32 above
Jan. 15.....	26 above
Jan. 16.....	20 above
Jan. 17.....	29 above
Jan. 18.....	26 above
Jan. 19.....	3 above
Jan. 20.....	9 above
Jan. 21.....	15 above
Jan. 22.....	14 above
Jan. 23.....	27 above
(8 inches of snow)	
Jan. 24.....	10 above
Jan. 25.....	10 above
Jan. 26.....	2 below
Jan. 27.....	10 below
Jan. 28.....	6 below
Jan. 29.....	25 above
Jan. 30.....	23 above
Jan. 31.....	13 above

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a very able and informative address by the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

THE CIVIL SERVICE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to remind the Members of the House that tomorrow H. R. 960, a bill which, if passed, would blanket in practically from 250,000 to 300,000 people into the civil service, is coming up. I want to

remind the membership of the House that at the present time there are 480,000 people on the civil-service eligible register in the District, and 500,000 people all over the country are on the eligible civil-service list, making a total of nearly 1,000,000 who are eligible civil-service workers who are not now employed in the Government.

I earnestly hope that the bill, if it cannot be amended to include open, competitive examinations for the civil service, will not be passed tomorrow. Think of the injustice to the nearly 1,000,000 eligible civil-service workers all over the country. They worked for their examinations; they won their spurs, and yet if these non-civil-service persons are blanketed in, how manifestly unfair that will be. The examinations should be open, competitive examinations. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of the business on the Speaker's table and the legislative program of the day, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the Wheeler-Lea transportation bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

MORE ABOUT THE WEATHER

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, referred to the remarks of my friend from Mississippi, I may add that I have had a letter from the folks at Hot Springs, S. Dak., where they saw the thermometer change 80 degrees inside of 24 hours, going from 30 below to 50 above. These vagaries of the weather inspired the columnist in the Rapid City Daily Journal the other day to observe that some fears had been expressed that snow would cave in the dome of the Capitol. The writer said, however, that he had no fears on that score as long as Congress is in session to "raise the roof." [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include therein certain definitions of parity offered by the Sioux City Tribune.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish the gentleman would tell us how that place got the name of Hot Springs.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Warm springs and streams make it the South Dakota banana belt where such a thing is possible. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the committees.

Mr. DEROUEN (when the Committee on Public Lands was called). Mr. Speaker, by direction of the committee I may state that the committee has five more or less minor bills that we expect to call up.

I first call up, Mr. Speaker, the bill (H. R. 5688) to provide for the operation of the recreational facilities within the Chopawamsic recreational demonstration project, near Dumfries, Va., by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. DEROUEN. I will be very pleased to do that, Mr. Speaker.

This proposed legislation would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to operate recreational facilities within the Chopawamsic recreational demonstration project located in Prince William and Stafford Counties, near Dumfries, Va., transferred to the said Secretary under the provisions of

Executive Order No. 7496, dated November 14, 1936, as part of the park system of the National Capital and its environs.

The area, which was very poor farm land, is located within 35 miles of Washington and constitutes an ideal recreational and camping area which is needed for organized camping facilities for various social service and other organizations such as the Associated Charities of Washington. Because of the lack of camping and recreational facilities in the National Capital, the development of the Chopawamsic area is endorsed by all of the social-service agencies of Washington and the various organizations dealing with youth movement.

During the period from October 1, 1937, to September 30, 1938, the area, which is in the process of development and consequently has but limited facilities, accommodated 1,876 campers and collected for the use of the facilities \$2,479.50 which sum was deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts. These campers represented the Boy Scouts, the Jewish Community Center, the Y. M. C. A., the Council of Social Agencies, the District of Columbia Cooperative League, and other local organizations.

Through the emergency conservation work program, camping facilities to serve approximately 7,500 people each season will be developed. The enlargement of the camp to meet the needs of the National Capital in this respect will result in an increase of revenue from the use of the facilities, and will necessitate the employment of a number of permanent employees for the maintenance, protection, and operation of the camp.

In the event it is found advantageous to operate the camping facilities indirectly, it is desired to have authority to enter into a contract or contracts with organizations such as the Community Chest, the Community Center, the Boys' Clubs, and so forth, or with reliable and qualified individuals. It is provided that the receipts derived from the operations of these recreational facilities shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter the lands comprising the Chopawamsic recreational demonstration project transferred to the Secretary of the Interior by Executive Order No. 7496, dated November 14, 1936, shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service as part of the park system of the National Capital and its environs.

SEC. 2. The Director of the National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, is authorized—

(a) To prescribe and collect fees and charges for such recreational and other facilities, conveniences, and services as may be furnished by the National Park Service for the accommodation of the public within the said area.

(b) To enter into a contract or contracts with any reliable person, organization, or corporation, without advertising and without securing competitive bids for the operation or performance of any such recreational or other facilities, conveniences, and services within the said area.

All revenues collected by the National Park Service, pursuant to the authority of this section, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 3. The Director of the National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, is authorized to exercise and perform with respect to the said area all the powers and duties that are conferred and imposed upon him by law in relation to the construction, maintenance, care, custody, policing, upkeep, and repair of the public buildings and parks in the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIMITATION OF COST OF CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDINGS IN NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 2624) to amend the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 460), as amended, with regard to the limitation of cost upon the construction of buildings in national parks, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the limitation of cost upon the construction of any administration or other building in any national park without express authority of Congress, contained in the act approved August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 460), as amended by the act of July 1, 1918 (40 Stat. 677), is hereby increased from \$1,500 to \$3,000.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEROUEN. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Does that give the Department the right to increase the construction cost of any particular buildings from \$1,500 to \$3,000?

Mr. DEROUEN. Not necessarily. It does this: The construction facilities in the various parks throughout the United States have not been reviewed and increased in 21 years—not since 1918. The first act of 1912 fixed the limitation at \$1,000 on this type of construction. The construction is for the repair of buildings, and buildings of small facilities. Then, in July 1918, the limitation was raised to \$1,500. Therefore 21 years elapsed, when the cost of materials and labor very greatly increased.

Mr. RICH. Does it state that the Department has the right to increase the cost of buildings?

Mr. DEROUEN. The Congress fixed the limitation at \$1,500, not higher.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman does not mean to say that we have not spent any money on parks? We have spent more money on parks in the last 7 years than had been theretofore spent on parks in the last 50 years.

Mr. DEROUEN. That may be true. I have not any remarks to make about that; but I do feel this is justified because the cost of construction and labor has increased. Therefore we should do it in this case, because we have done it for the other departments.

Mr. RICH. What we have to do is to be careful that we do not give the departments discretionary power to spend more and more money, because the gentleman will find that the cost of the upkeep of the parks that he has established and increased the size of in the last 5 years will be a great burden on the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEROUEN. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. To say this to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]: No construction can be done at all without a special appropriation for it, regardless of the fact that the limit of cost is increased from \$1,500 to \$3,000. There would have to be special appropriation by Congress just the same.

Mr. DEROUEN. That is true.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. And what type of buildings are these?

Mr. DEROUEN. These are small buildings.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Shelters, and so forth?

Mr. DEROUEN. Shelters, and so forth; accommodations for the public. Those that we have there now are dilapidated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

ADMINISTRATION AND MAINTENANCE OF BLUE RIDGE PARKWAY

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 4282, to amend the act of June 30, 1936 (49 Stat. 2041), providing for the administration and maintenance of the Blue Ridge Parkway, in the States of Virginia and North Carolina, by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I shall not object, but I do this for the purpose of calling to the attention of the membership the fact that the

microphones used on this floor are not being properly amplified so that the voices of those who speak into them can be heard by the other Members. I trust the gentleman who handles that will see to it that the voice is amplified to a greater extent than is now being done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what this bill is about.

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, this proposed legislation would extend the same provisions of law to the Blue Ridge Parkway which were extended by Congress over the Natchez Trace Parkway by the act of May 18, 1938 (52 Stat. 407). The administration of both the Blue Ridge and Natchez Trace Parkways has been placed under the jurisdiction of this Department, and under the terms of this proposed legislation uniform provisions of law would apply to both parkways.

Under the proposal herein recommended the Blue Ridge Parkway Act of June 30, 1936 (49 Stat. 2041), would be amended in two particulars: First, by authorizing the extension of the width of the parkway beyond the 200-foot limit prescribed in the above-mentioned act, where the parkway runs through Government-owned lands and where small parcels of Government-owned lands would otherwise be isolated, or where topographic conditions or scenic requirements are such that bridges, ditches, cuts, fills, parking overlooks, and landscape development could not reasonably be confined to a width of 200 feet; second, the above-mentioned act would be amended by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue revocable licenses or permits for rights-of-way across and upon parkway lands, or for the use of parkway lands by the owners or lessees of adjacent lands for such purposes and under such nondiscriminatory terms, regulations, and conditions as he may determine to be not inconsistent with the use of such lands for parkway purposes.

In some instances a relatively small parcel of land under the administration of another department is isolated or segregated from the main reservation by projecting the parkway through such reservation and, as administrative difficulties are frequently encountered by the department or agency having a small portion of its lands so isolated or separated from the main reservation, it may in some cases be preferred to administer such small parcels of land as a part of the parkway. In some instances the topography of the land will not permit parkway standards to be maintained on a width of only 200 feet. This is particularly true when extensive ditches, cuts, and fills are necessary. In addition, scenic requirements cannot be maintained on a 200-foot limitation in the width of the parkway.

The construction of the Blue Ridge Parkway was commenced under the authority of title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933 (49 Stat. 195). After the parkway rights-of-way had been conveyed to the United States it became apparent that it would be in the interest of the United States to authorize former landowners and adjacent landowners to use parkway lands for agricultural and residential purposes where such uses were not inconsistent with the parkway development program. In other cases it was necessary to authorize the use of parkway lands for ingress and egress by adjacent landowners whose lands had been severed by the parkway. It was also found necessary to permit the use of parkway lands for public-utility crossings. While the parkway lands were administered pursuant to the terms of the National Industrial Recovery Act, there was authority to authorize the use of parkway lands for these purposes. However, the Blue Ridge Parkway is now being administered and maintained, pursuant to the provisions of the act of June 30, 1936, by the National Park Service, subject to the provisions of the act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended, and it is doubtful whether the parkway lands may be authorized to be used for the purposes described above. The proposed legislation, in addition to authorizing the widening of the parkway in certain cases,

would remove existing doubt as to the authority to grant leases and licenses for the stated purposes.

The Clerk began the reading of the bill.

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEROUEN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I would like to ask the gentleman, if you are going to grant this permission to the Blue Ridge Parkway and the Natchez Trace to extend that width beyond 200 feet, what does the Public Lands Committee feel will be necessary for the Federal Government to do to improve it as is planned by the parkway?

Mr. DEROUEN. I do not think this adds anything. This really is facilitating and aiding the two agencies, because the development does not require any additional land. This land is Government-owned. This is merely correlating the two agencies of the Department of Agriculture in all of these lands.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEROUEN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am quite familiar with what is involved in this bill. From the Department's standpoint, it is just an administrative matter. In the first place, it gives the Department the same powers it now has with respect to the Natchez Trace—that is in some instances if their plans for recreational development might require a little more than the 200 feet—and it only deals with public lands, mind you.

Mr. RICH. It only deals with public lands?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is right. The Forest Service could let them go over a few feet; or this parkway might strike a piece of forest land that leaves a little triangle, and the Forest Service would much prefer to have the Park Service administer it. It involves no additional expense or financing of any kind. It is administrative. But from the standpoint of the people of Virginia, North Carolina, and Tennessee there is a vital provision in this bill in which we are deeply interested. It has been the practice of the Park Service to limit the crossing right of the Blue Ridge Parkway to those roads reserved as crossing roads in the deeds of conveyance from the States to the Federal Government. That has shut off a lot of private adjoining landowners who had private roads that they used to go out with. This bill will authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant revocable permits to that private landowner to cross the Blue Ridge Parkway to get out with his farm products and with his normal travel.

Mr. RICH. Then you are not going to block the private owner from getting across the parkway?

Mr. ROBERTSON. This is to permit them to get out and that is the reason we are so vitally interested. We have a lot of them tied up right now.

Mr. RICH. Are you figuring on making any overhead crossings to speak of that will cost additional funds?

Mr. ROBERTSON. None whatever. Of course, the Park Service has been insisting on the State highway department, when they convey a right-of-way that excludes some adjoining landowner from his normal outlet, to provide him an outlet somewhere else. But that has frequently proven to be expensive. However, if there is any additional expense, it falls upon the State and not upon the Federal Government. This merely authorizes overhead crossings at grade level.

Mr. RICH. As far as the Federal Government is concerned, you figure that because of this bill you are not going to put any more burdens on the Federal Government for the Natchez Trace and Blue Ridge Parkway?

Mr. ROBERTSON. We are not going to put any financial burdens on, but we are going to lift what we think are some unnecessary restrictions upon the people.

Mr. RICH. Well, the people who wanted this were the people in Virginia, North Carolina, and Tennessee. You fellows came in here with tears in your eyes and got us to make this appropriation. Now you find you have got yourselves into a little trouble and you want to get out the best way you can. But what we want to know is that the people in Pennsylvania

are not going to pay any more for your people down there to be accommodated.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Not one red cent.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, and I think I will object. I want to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania what more burden do you want than the few hundred millions that are already authorized?

Mr. RICH. I do not want any burden.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. It is one of the crimes of the ages—this Natchez Trace and Skyline Drive. Now the Government has built enough miles of the Skyline Drive for the people of Washington and the tourists to ride over and see the Blue Ridge Mountains on their crest. It is one of the wildest dreams of the New Deal that we ever authorized this thing—500 miles long to the Great Smoky Mountains and the Natchez Trace hooked up with it. The first crime came when the money was taken from relief money without authorization. I think this whole thing and the expenditures that we are fixing on the United States for its future is one of the crimes of the last few years, and I object to anything that facilitates it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman only objects to dispensing with further reading of the bill. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the administration and maintenance of the Blue Ridge Parkway, in the States of Virginia and North Carolina, by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1936 (49 Stat. 2041), be amended to read as follows:

"That all lands and easements heretofore or hereafter conveyed to the United States by the States of Virginia and North Carolina for the right-of-way for the projected parkway between the Shenandoah and Great Smoky Mountains National Parks, together with sites acquired or to be acquired for recreational areas in connection therewith, and a right-of-way for said parkway of a width sufficient to include the highway and all bridges, ditches, cuts, and fills appurtenant thereto, but not exceeding a maximum of 200 feet through Government-owned lands (except that where small parcels of Government-owned lands would otherwise be isolated, or where topographic conditions or scenic requirements are such that bridges, ditches, cuts, fills, parking overlooks, and landscape development, could not reasonably be confined to a width of 200 feet, the said maximum may be increased to such width as may be necessary, with the written approval of the department or agency having jurisdiction over such lands) as designated on maps heretofore or hereafter approved by the Secretary of the Interior, shall be known as the Blue Ridge Parkway and shall be administered and maintained by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service, subject to the provisions of the act of Congress approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," the provisions of which act, as amended and supplemented, are hereby extended over and made applicable to said parkway: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Interior, to connect with the parkway such roads and trails as may be necessary for the protection, administration, or utilization of adjacent and nearby national forests and the resources thereof: *And provided further*, That the Forest Service and the National Park Service shall, insofar as practicable, coordinate and correlate such recreational development as each may plan, construct, or permit to be constructed, on lands within their respective jurisdictions which, by mutual agreement, should be given special treatment for recreational purposes.

"Sec. 2. In the administration of the Blue Ridge Parkway, the Secretary of the Interior may issue revocable licenses or permits for rights-of-way over, across, and upon parkway lands, or for the use of parkway lands by the owners or lessees of adjacent lands, for such purposes and under such nondiscriminatory terms, regulations, and conditions as he may determine to be not inconsistent with the use of such lands for parkway purposes.

"Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to approve and accept, on behalf of the United States, title to any lands and interests in land heretofore or hereafter conveyed to the United States for the purposes of the Blue Ridge or the Natchez Trace Parkways, or for recreational areas in connection therewith."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 11, strike out the word "and", and after the word "development" insert "recreational and other facilities requisite to public use of said parkway."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I am objecting to the passage of the bill if it is proper to do so now, or shall object to it at the proper time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is not a question of unanimous consent. The bill is called up under Calendar Wednesday rules in the regular way.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6813) to accept the cession by the States of North Carolina and Tennessee of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the act of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina, approved March 18, 1929, and the act of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, approved April 12, 1929, ceding to the United States exclusive jurisdiction over and within certain lands within said States as may be acquired for the Great Smoky Mountains National Park are hereby accepted and sole and exclusive jurisdiction is hereby assumed by the United States over such lands, saving, however, to the State of North Carolina and to the State of Tennessee, respectively, the right to serve civil or criminal process within the limits of the area ceded by such State in suits or prosecutions for or on account of any rights acquired, obligations incurred, or crimes committed in such State outside of said park; and saving further to each such State the right to tax persons and corporations, their franchises and property on the lands included in such ceded area; and saving also to the persons residing in said park now, or hereafter, the right to vote at all elections held within the county in which they reside; and saving further to each such State the right to tax sales in such ceded area of gasoline and other motor-vehicle fuels and oil for use in motor vehicles. All laws applicable to places under the sole and exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, including section 289 of the Criminal Code, as amended (18 U. S. C. 468), shall have force and effect in said park. All fugitives from justice taking refuge in said park shall be subject to the same laws as refugees from justice found in either the State of North Carolina or Tennessee.

Sec. 2. That the portion of said park located in the State of North Carolina shall constitute a part of the United States judicial district for the western district of North Carolina and the portion of said park located in the State of Tennessee shall constitute a part of the United States judicial district for the eastern district of Tennessee, and the district court of the United States in and for each such district shall have jurisdiction over all offenses committed within the ceded area of the said park in such district.

Sec. 3. That all hunting or the killing, wounding, or capturing at any time of any wild bird or animal, except dangerous animals when it is necessary to prevent them from destroying human lives or inflicting personal injury, is prohibited within the limits of said park; nor shall any fish be taken out of any of the waters of the said park, in any other way than by hook and line, and then only at such seasons and at such times and in such manner as may be directed by the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior shall make and publish such general rules and regulations as he may deem necessary and proper for the management and care of the park and for the protection of the property therein, especially for the preservation from injury or spoliation of all timber, mineral deposits, natural curiosities, or wonderful objects within said park, and for the protection of the animals and birds in the park from capture or destruction, and to prevent their being frightened or driven from the said park; and he shall make rules and regulations governing the taking of fish from the streams or lakes in the said park. Possession within said park of the dead bodies or any part thereof of any wild bird or animal shall be prima facie evidence that the person or persons having the same are guilty of violating this act. Any person or persons, stage or express company, railway or other transportation company, who knows or has reason to believe that such wild birds, fish, or animals were taken or killed contrary to the provisions of this act or the rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior, and who receives for transportation the dead bodies or any part thereof of the wild birds, fish, or animals so taken or killed, or who shall violate any of the other provisions of this act, or the rules and regulations, with reference to the management and care of the said park, or for the protection of the property therein for the preservation from injury or spoliation of timber, mineral deposits, natural curiosities, or wonderful objects within said park, or for the protection of the animals, birds, and fish in said park, or who shall within said park commit any damage, injury, or spoliation to or upon any building, frame, sign, hedge, gate, guidepost, tree, wood, underwood, timber, garden, crops, vegetables, plants, land, springs, mineral deposits, natural curiosities, or other matter or

thing growing or being thereon, or situated therein, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be subject to a fine of not more than \$500 or imprisonment not exceeding 6 months, or both, and be adjudged to pay all the costs of the proceedings.

Sec. 4. That all guns, traps, nets, seines, fishing tackle, teams, horses, or means of transportation of every nature or description used by any person or persons within the limits of said park when engaged in killing, trapping, ensnaring, taking, or capturing such wild birds, fish, or animals contrary to the provisions of this act or the rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior, shall be forfeited to the United States and may be seized by the officers in said park and held pending prosecution of any person or persons arrested under the charge of violating the provisions of this act, and upon conviction under this act of such person or persons using said guns, traps, nets, seines, fishing tackle, teams, horses, or other means of transportation, such forfeiture shall be adjudicated as a penalty in addition to the other punishment prescribed in this act. Such forfeited property shall be disposed of and accounted for by and under the authority of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That the forfeiture of teams, horses, or other means of transportation shall be in the discretion of the court.

Sec. 5. That upon the recommendation and approval of the Secretary of the Interior of a qualified candidate the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina and the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee shall jointly appoint a commissioner, who shall have jurisdiction to hear and act upon all complaints made of any violations of law or of the rules and regulations made by the Secretary of the Interior for the government of the park and for the protection of the animals, birds, and fish, and objects of interest therein, and for other purposes, authorized by this act. Such commissioner shall have power, upon sworn information, to issue process in the name of the United States for the arrest of any person charged with the commission of any misdemeanor, or charged with a violation of the rules and regulations, or with a violation of any of the provisions of this act prescribed for the government of said park and for the protection of the animals, birds, and fish in said park, and to try the person so charged, and, if found guilty, to impose punishment and to adjudge the forfeiture prescribed. In all cases of conviction an appeal shall lie from the judgment of said commissioner to the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, or the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee, respectively, depending upon the district in which the particular land in said park on which the offense shall have taken place is located; and the United States district courts in the aforementioned districts shall jointly prescribe the rules of procedure and practice for said commissioner in the trial of cases and for appeal to said United States district courts.

Sec. 6. That such of the United States commissioners for the western judicial district of North Carolina and the eastern judicial district of Tennessee as may be designated for the purpose, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior, by the respective district courts for such districts shall have authority to exercise the same jurisdiction with respect to offenses against law and the rules and regulations made in pursuance thereof, committed within their respective judicial districts, as the park commissioner provided for in this act is authorized to exercise.

Sec. 7. That the park commissioner provided for in this act shall also have power to issue process as hereinbefore provided for the arrest of any person charged with the commission within said park of any criminal offense not covered by the provisions of section 3 of this act, to hear the evidence introduced, and, if he is of the opinion that probable cause is shown for holding the person so charged for trial, shall commit such person for further appropriate action, and certify a transcript of the record of his proceedings and the testimony in such case to the particular district court, which court shall have jurisdiction of the case: *Provided*, That the said commissioner may grant bail in all cases according to the laws of the United States.

Sec. 8. That process issued by such commissioner shall be directed to the marshal of the United States for the western district of North Carolina or for the eastern district of Tennessee, as the case may be, but nothing herein contained shall be so construed as to prevent the arrest by any officer or employee of the Government or any person employed by the United States, without process, of any person taken in the act of violating the law or this act or the regulations prescribed by the said Secretary as aforesaid.

Sec. 9. That the park commissioner provided for in this act shall be paid an annual salary, as appropriated for by Congress: *Provided*, That the said commissioner shall reside within the exterior boundaries of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park or at a place reasonably adjacent to the park, the place of residence to be designated by the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 10. That all fees, costs, and expenses arising in cases under this act and properly chargeable to the United States shall be certified, approved, and paid as are like fees, costs, and expenses in the courts of the United States.

Sec. 11. That all fees, fines, and costs and expenses imposed and collected shall be deposited by the commissioner, or by the marshal of the United States collecting the same, with the clerk of the respective United States district courts for either the western district of North Carolina or the eastern district of Tennessee, depending upon the district in which the offense for which collection is made shall have taken place.

Sec. 12. That the Secretary of the Interior shall notify in writing the Governors of the States of North Carolina and Tennessee of

the passage and approval of this act, and of the fact that the United States assumes police jurisdiction over said park as specified in said acts of the States of North Carolina and Tennessee.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS IN ALASKA

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6658) to authorize the lease or sale of certain public lands in Alaska, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sections numbered 16 and 36 in Tps. 17 and 18 N., Rs. 1 and 2 E. Seward meridian, Alaska, are hereby released from the reservation thereof made by the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1214), for the support of the common schools in the Territory of Alaska, and in lieu of the lands so released an equal area of vacant, nonmineral, surveyed, unreserved, public lands in the Territory of Alaska may be designated and reserved for the support of the common schools in the Territory of Alaska in the manner provided by the act of February 28, 1891 (26 Stat. 796), as amended.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to lease, or to sell at not less than \$1.25 per acre, under such rules and regulations and upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, the lands released from reservation by section 1 of this act and the public lands in Tps. 17 and 18 N., Rs. 1 and 2 E.; secs. 25, 26, 27, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35, T. 17 N., R. 1 W.; secs. 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, T. 16 N., R. 1 W.; secs. 1 to 11 and 12, T. 16 N., R. 2 W., Seward meridian, Alaska: *Provided, however*, That all patents and leases issued under the provisions of this act shall contain a reservation to the United States of the oil, gas, and other mineral deposits, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe. The provisions of this section are subject to valid existing rights.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, after the parenthesis, strike out the comma and the word "as" and insert a period.

Page 2, line 2, strike out the word "amended," and the period.

Page 2, strike out all of line 11 and insert in lieu thereof, "16 north, range 1 west; sections 1, 2, 11, and 12, township."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC LANDS IN ALASKA

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 7252) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell or lease for park or recreational purposes, and to sell for cemetery purposes, certain public lands in Alaska.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to appraise and sell, or to lease, to any incorporated city or town in Alaska, for park or recreational purposes, not to exceed 160 acres of vacant and unreserved public lands in the Territory, which, in his opinion, are reasonably accessible to such city or town, and to appraise and sell to any such city or town, for cemetery purposes, not to exceed 80 acres of such land: *Provided*, That each patent issued under the provisions of this act shall contain a reservation to the United States of the coal and other mineral deposits in the land conveyed, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same, under rules and regulations issued by the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 2. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the act of September 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 502), shall not apply to the Territory of Alaska.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, that completes the business of the Committee on the Public Lands.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address on the American aviation industry today by Col. John H. Jewett, president of the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce of America, Inc., delivered January 27, 1940, over the Mutual Broadcasting System.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I was allotted 30 minutes in which to address the House today at the conclusion of the legislative program for the day. Has the legislative program been concluded?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It has not.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from committees:

FEBRUARY 7, 1940.

HON. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,

Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Herewith I wish to tender my resignation from the following committees: World War Veterans' Legislation, District of Columbia, Insular Affairs, Patents, and Census, in order to become a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Cordially yours,

RUDOLPH G. TENEROWICZ, M. C.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On January 31, 1940:

H. J. Res. 419. Joint resolution to extend, for 3 additional months, the time during which articles imported free of duty for exhibition at the Golden Gate International Exposition or the New York World's Fair may be sold or abandoned.

On February 1, 1940:

H. R. 7293. An act to amend section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to make permissive the acquisition of legislative jurisdiction over land or interests in land acquired by the United States.

H. R. 7342. An act to amend the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended.

STATE, COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1941

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8319) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Commerce, and Justice, and for the judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8319, State, Commerce, Justice, and the judiciary appropriation bill, 1941, with Mr. BEAM in the chair.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries: For Secretary of State—Under Secretary of State, \$10,000; Counselor, \$10,000; and other personal services in the District of Columbia, including temporary employees, and not to exceed \$6,500 for employees engaged on piece work at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of State; \$2,450,000: *Provided*, That in expending appropriations or portions of appropriations, contained in this act, for the payment of personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, with the exception of the four Assistant Secretaries of State and the Legal Adviser of the Department of State, the Assistant to the Attorney General, the Assistant Solicitor General, and six Assistant Attorneys General, the Assistant Secretaries of Commerce, the average of the salaries of the total number of persons under any grade in any bureau, office, or other appropriation unit shall not at any time exceed the average of the compensation rates specified for the grade by such act, as amended, and in grades in which only one position is allocated the salary of such position shall not exceed the average of the compensation rates for the grade, except that in unusually meritorious cases of one position in a grade advances may be made to rates higher than the average of the compensation rates of the grade but not more often than once in any fiscal year and then only to the next higher rate: *Provided*, That this restriction shall not apply (1) to grades 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the clerical-mechanical service, or (2) to require the reduction in salary of any person whose compensation was fixed as of July 1, 1924, in accordance with the rules of section 6 of such act, or (3) to require the reduction in salary of any person who is transferred from one position to another position in the same or different grade in the same or a different bureau, office, or other appropriation unit, or (4) to prevent the payment of a salary under any grade at a rate higher than the maximum rate of the grade when such higher rate is permitted by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and is specifically authorized by other law, or (5) to reduce the compensation of any person in a grade in which only one position is allocated.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. CALDWELL: Page 2, line 8, strike out "\$2,450,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,458,000."

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is to make this figure allowed the State Department conform to that given other departments of the Government.

The Committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, ambassadors and ministers: For salaries of ambassadors and ministers, including salaries as authorized by section 1740, Revised Statutes, as amended by the act of April 24, 1939 (53 Stat. 583), as follows: Ambassadors Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Argentina, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Poland, Spain, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and Venezuela, at \$17,500 each.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK: Page 6, line 10, after the word "Turkey", strike out the words "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, there are two other amendments relating to this particular subject, one on page 7 and the other on page 17, which I expect to offer. It seems to me it would be advisable to consider these three amendments together because they cover the same subject matter, and if we offer the three of them together, instead of having the three different amendments offered three times and having three fights, we can have the question settled on one occasion.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the other two amendments may be reported for the information of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the other two amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 3, strike out "\$660,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$642,500."

Page 17, after line 14, insert "Provided, That no appropriation contained under the caption 'foreign intercourse' shall be used for the maintenance of an embassy of the United States in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or for salaries or any character of expense, other than salaries, for the maintenance of any office or officer of the United States State Department in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that these three amendments may be considered together.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I see no objection to discussing the three amendments at this time and confining the discussion of those amendments to this particular time, with the provision that when those points are reached in the bill the amendments will be voted upon without further discussion. With that understanding I am perfectly content to go along and discuss them now.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree to that. I think the three amendments are in fact only one amendment. It is necessary to offer three different amendments because the particular matter to be amended is contained on three different pages of the bill. We ought to vote on them on only one occasion or else we will have separate fights on each one of them.

Mr. CALDWELL. I think perhaps we would be willing to discuss all of them at this time and vote on the amendments without further discussion later, but it would be proper to take them up only one at a time.

Mr. McCORMACK. It seems to me this is for the gentleman's own benefit. I am offering this unanimous-consent request for the benefit of the gentleman who is in charge of the bill.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I think these amendments should be taken up in the order in which we reach them, thus disposing of them in the regular orderly way.

Mr. McCORMACK. All right. I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Are we going to have an opportunity to discuss the amendment which the gentleman intends to propose? I would like to be heard.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. May I ask the gentlemen in charge of the bill on both sides whether liberal debate will be had in view of the fact this is a very important amendment? It has to do with the question of recognition of Soviet Russia, nothing else or nothing more. It is a matter that should be discussed in detail on its merits and demerits. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts ought to have more than 5 minutes to present this matter, and others who want to be heard should have ample time.

Mr. CALDWELL. I may say to the gentleman that this is not the place for the matter to be taken up, nor should it be considered here. This is not the bill under which we should discuss whether we are going to recognize or fail to recognize Russia.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I am not yielding for the gentleman from Florida to make his argument in my time. The question had to do with liberal debate. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1½ minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask the Chair to state the time remaining for the gentleman from Massachusetts?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has eight and a half minutes remaining.

Mr. CALDWELL. What was the unanimous-consent request?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asked unanimous consent to proceed for an additional one and a half minutes. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. CALDWELL. I have no objection, but I shall object to any further extension of time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important and a very serious matter. In offering these amendments I do so only after profound consideration.

The purpose of the pending amendment is to prevent any money appropriated in this bill being used for the payment of the salary of the Ambassador to the Soviet Union, the nation which we all know is more commonly described as Communist Russia. The chairman of the subcommittee has suggested that this is not the proper place to consider this question. He let out his argument in response to a question from the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]. This is the proper place. We have the responsibility of appropriating money. True, the question of diplomatic relationship in itself rests with the executive branch of the Government, but under the Constitution we have the power of expressing our own views as a body when appropriation bills are under consideration. In rare cases, such as in the case of the Soviet Union, we are justified in exercising our constitutional power.

The argument that this is not the place for this question to be discussed certainly is irrelevant if advanced from a constitutional angle, because the framers of the Constitution left it with Congress to appropriate money. If Congress has the power to appropriate money, Congress has the power not to appropriate money for any particular purpose.

What are the circumstances which prompted me? In 1933 the Soviet Union was recognized in a semidiplomatic manner, as a result of the so-called Litvinov agreement. In this agreement the Soviet Union as a government gave its express and solemn promise to the Government of the United States and to our people that they would not permit "the formation or residence on the territory of the Soviet Union of any organization or group, and that they would prevent the activity on that territory of any organization or group or any representatives or officials of any organization or group which has as an aim the overthrow or preparation for overthrow or the bringing about by force of a change in the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States, its Territories, or possessions."

This is a promise made by the Soviet Union to our Government. This promise was broken within 1 month after it was made. This promise has been repeatedly broken ever since it was made. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], who was chairman of the special committee that investigated subversive activities, brought out evidence of a direct connection between the American section of the Communist Party and the Third International and the Communist Party of Russia, which is the backbone of that Government, and found that Russia was injecting itself directly into the internal affairs of the United States by furnishing money and contributing in every way possible to that which they hope for, the ultimate overthrow of our Government. The committee of which I was chairman uncovered the same type of evidence of the activity directly in our country of the Third International and the Soviet Government, collaborating with the American section of the Communist Party in their effort to obtain their ultimate objective, of the overthrow of our Government by force and violence.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS. Is it not entirely within the power of the President to accomplish what the gentleman desires and what most of us desire?

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman will remember my views—and I speak my own views and I criticize no one, and

when I have fixed views I have the courage to attempt to express them and to carry them into operation—I called several months ago for the recall of the American Ambassador when an official of the Russian Government undertook to affect public opinion in the United States on a domestic question. I would not care how it was done, even though he might have made a speech with reference to a domestic matter along lines with which I might have agreed, a soviet official has no right to do that, or the official of any other government.

To give the gentleman a direct answer, yes; but we do not want any political aspects to the consideration of this question today if we can avert it. Let us look at it from our own angle as Members of Congress, determined to do our duty as we see it, whether or not we are going to vote an appropriation to maintain an American Ambassador to the Soviet Union, when we know, and every American knows, that the Soviet Union has repeatedly breached its solemn obligation, and when every American knows that the Soviet Union is doing everything within its power to overthrow established government not only here but throughout the entire world.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Could we not make provision to export the present Communist Soviet Ambassador, who is now in the Nation's Capital, at the same time as we do this?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am trying to address the Committee from the angle that I think is most appropriate on this occasion. I am sure the gentleman from Wisconsin can adequately answer that question. I am sure, also, that if this amendment is adopted, the Soviet Ambassador to the United States will probably be called back to Moscow.

There is a very compelling reason behind my offering this amendment. The Fish committee, the McCormack committee, the Dies committee uncovered evidence warranting it. Within the last year our Government has made protests on a number of occasions to the Soviet Union because of their breaching not only this solemn obligation but other rights possessed by citizens of the United States under international law, and they have all been pigeon-holed. We saw the spectacle the other day when The Assistant Secretary of War made a speech, as he had a right to, and referred to the people of Russia as serfs—and such a reference can be found in history; it is not necessarily an adverse characterization; history records it—we witnessed the Soviet Ambassador going down to the State Department to enter a protest against that mild characterization.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. I understood the gentleman to say that the recommendations of the several committees which have made investigations were pigeonholed.

Mr. McCORMACK. No.

Mr. KERR. That is what the gentleman said.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; if I did say it, I am glad the gentleman has corrected me. I referred to the protests of the American Government to the Soviet Union.

Mr. KERR. I wanted to find out, if I could, who pigeonholed these reports. The gentleman says he did not say they were pigeonholed?

Mr. McCORMACK. I said the protests of our Government to the Soviet Union have been pigeonholed.

Mr. KERR. I may have misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am pleased to have any misunderstanding removed.

Mr. KERR. I understood the gentleman to say that these reports had all been pigeonholed.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I said that the Fish committee, the McCormack committee, and the Dies committee have shown by incontrovertible, sworn evidence that the Soviet Union and the Third International and the Communist Party

of Russia have violated a solemn obligation made by the Soviet Government to our Government.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I hope the gentleman has observed in the press that the United States district attorney at Detroit just recently has uncovered and produced evidence to the grand jury which has resulted in the indictment of those operating directly with funds furnished by the Soviet Union and its organization to enlist men, in violation of our law, to go over and fight in Spain.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. KEEFE. And those people have been indicted because of such an absolute and flagrant violation of our law.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. Furthermore, three were indicted in the District of Columbia for violation of the Foreign Propaganda Registration Act, which my special committee recommended and I had the honor and pleasure of drafting and filing. There is no question about the violation. The only question is whether or not we have the courage to carry out not only our own personal feelings but the feelings of the American people by failing to appropriate this money. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that the amendments offered here, the one under discussion now and the two additional ones, are the result, in a measure, of a resolution that I introduced in the House, which was practically the first one entered on the House calendars at the beginning of this session. This resolution provided for the same things which these amendments provide.

The only way to strike at Russian recognition is through this appropriation bill. In the first place, recognition of Russia was had without any congressional action; without any support by the Senate; without any ordinary movement of any of the operating forces which had been in opposition to such recognition; in fact, there was not and never has been used the words "recognition of Russia" in the document, and the only thing that showed that we had recognized Russia was the placing of an Ambassador in Moscow. Not only did we not recognize Russia in the ordinary way, but we did it through a series of letters between the President of the United States and Commissar Litvinov. He had hardly gone away from the National Capital, after discussing these things with the President and making promises, when he began to violate them. Up until the establishment of an Embassy of Russia in the United States, the Amtorg, a supposedly commercial organization, was the one which operated for Russia.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Can the gentleman conceive of any reason why the administration should recognize Russia without the consent of the Congress?

Mr. BOLLES. Yes; I can. I think it was thought at the time—I do not contend that I am a mind reader—there was a great deal of controversy over whether we should recognize the Soviet or not, and, while the President has the power, yet the ordinary procedure with respect to a matter of that importance would be to have the Senate first pass upon it. But the President just did it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLES. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Following the thought of the gentleman, may I suggest that perhaps the reason for recognition, although not valid in the gentleman's own mind, was that Litvinov, acting for Russia and the Soviet Government of that country, gave certain promises to those who handled the United States negotiations. The gentleman is aware also that any promises which were made have been broken.

Mr. BOLLES. Not only that, but among some of the other promises was one to meet some of the debts that

Russia owed or an acknowledgment of the debt, and, also, that we should have no further subversive action here. This has been shown by the McCormack committee and the others, yet the Amtorg was the salesman for the Soviet Government in the United States and through it, and through that commercial organization it was stimulating the subversive organizations here from Boardman, in Michigan, to other places through the support of divers and sundry newspapers and various pieces of literature, the distribution of which literature was paid for from the funds of the Amtorg—the Russian organization in America.

When we established an embassy, the Amtorg was dismissed, but, so far as the subversive movements are concerned, they continued. Where were the headquarters established for the Communist Government of Russia in the United States? When they put an embassy here in Washington, was it rushed from the Amtorg to Washington? I would like to know.

I am for this amendment. It is a part of what I had in mind when I introduced my resolution, and we might just as well fight it out right here.

If we want to do something for Finland, we do not have to ship them arms. We can tell the Finnish people, for whom we have sympathy, that we are not in sympathy with the people who are fighting them and murdering them. We can do it emphatically by adopting this amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I heard a remark here today that this is not the place to consider striking out the item with reference to the maintenance of our embassy and thus severing our diplomatic relationship with Russia. I say that this is the place and a most opportune time. I am one who invariably opposes the Appropriations Committee legislating on matters of policy, but the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union considering the work of any committee is the superbody that has a right to pass on or change and amend anything and insofar as I am concerned, if I can cripple communism by that method I am going to do it here and now. [Applause.] There is no such thing as a partisan taint or color in the consideration of this matter and I am looking to my colleagues on both sides of the House to take this, the first opportunity, to speak out in unmistakable terms, and in such a way that the fiendish Molotovs and the scoundrelly murderous Stalins will know and remember the American attitude. I will not pay much attention as to the method employed when the objective is the all important thing.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And the gentleman believes also, I think, that the United States should stop buying gold from Russia at twice its actual cost.

Mr. DINGELL. I am in favor of doing anything to cripple the communism of Russia.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And that that money, which we give to Russia for the purchase of gold is used to buy armament with which to fight Finland.

Mr. DINGELL. I would cut off the benefit, if any, right under the ears, and not give a dime to Russian communism under any circumstances. I think the sooner we do that the better off we will be. The Soviet Government, after receiving recognition by the United States, proceeded to violate every assurance given to the Government of the United States. There is not a single, solitary shred of evidence anywhere I know of to show that they have ever fulfilled their end of the agreement or that they intended in the future to proceed in the manner that would inspire American confidence. There was an attempt to gain a profitable

objective and then to proceed in the usual way to undermine the Government of the United States. I think that the temper of the House is such as to show the world what we think of the Soviet cause, the Soviet system, and the Soviet relationship. I think moreover that the membership at this time is ready to strangle the monster.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes.

Mr. EATON. Assuming the converse of this, will the gentleman support a motion to take care of Finland by making them a loan with which they may protect their women and children?

Mr. DINGELL. I think my attitude as regards Finland, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, as well as toward martyred Poland, is well known. I will do anything for them—not only sell them rifles at a dollar apiece, but supply at cost all the ammunition and buckshot they can burn. Yes, I am willing to donate the first Garand rifle for the immediate benefit of Finland and later to do the same for Poland.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. A few days ago an argument was advanced on this floor that we should not close the American Embassy in Russia because there were certain so-called facts that we wanted to know. Does the gentleman think that is a valid reason?

Mr. DINGELL. I do not think the argument holds water at all. We are not interested in anything that exists in Soviet Russia today.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I want to express my approval in general of the remarks that the gentleman has made both as to our breaking off diplomatic relations with Russia and also aid to Finland. He has very nearly expressed my thought, and I believe the thought of the American people. Perhaps we ought to do this in another way—but we ought to do it. This is the first time we have yet had a chance to express our sentiments.

Mr. DINGELL. I think the sentiments expressed here on both sides by Members are generally the opinions and feelings of a great majority of the membership of this House, which reflect the attitude of our people. All references and provisions having to do directly or indirectly with anything that concerns Soviet Russia in this bill should be stricken out and there should be no argument on the point at all.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. I would like to read from the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 469, in a speech made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS], wherein he said that not a dollar of gold was bought from England or any other nation, not an ounce bought simply to acquire gold, that it was only done in ordinary business transactions. I do that because that is a very remarkable statement.

Mr. DINGELL. If my attitude in the matter is what is being considered, I would say to the gentleman that I would not buy a penny's worth of gold from Soviet Russia.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. This is one of the most important issues with which we will be confronted. We cannot get the full membership of the House here except in one way, and that is by moving that the Committee rise and then making the point of no quorum. I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and nineteen Members are present, a

quorum. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, no one has questioned the right of the President of the United States to recognize Soviet Russia. It is true he recognized Soviet Russia against the request of the American Federation of Labor, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the church elements, and most every other fraternal and patriotic group in the United States. Certain definite promises were made at that time by Commissar Litvinov prior to recognition. Practically none of those promises have been fulfilled. Practically every one of them has been repudiated, and so it is perfectly right and fair that the Members of this House should refuse appropriations and stop providing funds to continue an American Embassy at Moscow. I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] that this may be one of the most important issues before the House of Representatives.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I am in agreement with the amendment. What I wanted to do was to get the Members here.

Mr. FISH. I think the gentleman is right. I regret that the full membership of the House is not present. This is a great issue, and the main question is whether the House has the courage to face the issue or whether we will just pussyfoot and shadow-box and say we are powerless; that the great legislative body that controls appropriations is impotent; that we have no rights in this matter.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FISH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. We have information that at least a part of the compensation that has been paid by this Government to disabled veterans now living in Russia has been confiscated by the Russian Government and used for propaganda to help overthrow this Government. I am for putting a stop to it now.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, my appeal here is on non-partisan grounds. I want the Members of the House, whether Republicans or Democrats, to have the courage to vote their own views, their own conscience, their own sentiments, and their own convictions.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman spoke about the House having courage.

Mr. FISH. That is right.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think that the House, in expressing that courage by a favorable vote on this amendment, would be reflecting the true sentiment of the overwhelming population of this country.

Mr. FISH. That is the very reason I raise that issue, because we are sent here by the people, elected by the people to carry out their wishes, and I believe that 90 percent of the people today are in favor of severing all diplomatic relations with that godless and despotic nation, Soviet Russia. The only question is whether we will be talked out of it; whether we will be told we are going beyond our powers, and are scared out of doing by our vote what we want to do—sever diplomatic relations with Communist Russia.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I will say to the gentleman from New York that I was opposed to the recognition of Russia when it was done. I am opposed to it now, and I expect to vote for the elimination of this appropriation.

Mr. FISH. Good for you.

Mr. MAY. But the question I am raising is this: If we do vote for the amendment and eliminate the Embassy in Moscow, may we not remove all sources of information that we might need?

Mr. FISH. Let me answer the gentleman. It has been said upon this floor that we should keep an Ambassador in Moscow to act as a spy. Is that the American way of doing business—to have our Ambassador over there to act in the

capacity of a spy? It is something we have never done before. We know that Soviet Russia is not a friendly nation; that it is an unfriendly nation. We know that they are spreading their Communist propaganda all the time through their agencies over here, and the time has come to stop it.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FISH. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Will the cutting off of the salary of the Ambassador have the effect of severing diplomatic relations?

Mr. FISH. No; but the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] proposes, after the will of the House is expressed on this amendment, to follow it with two other amendments which will be completely effective in severing diplomatic relations.

Mr. CELLER. Why does not the gentleman's committee bring in a straightforward resolution severing diplomatic relations, rather than doing this through the back door?

Mr. FISH. Our committee has not even granted a hearing on numerous bills of similar character. This is the first opportunity the House has had to express itself on this issue. Only a few weeks ago Earl Browder of your city and my city was sent to jail. Why? For using forged passports to go over there to learn about communism and to bring back and spread revolutionary communism in the United States. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC].

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, everyone wants to hurt Russia, but you are not going to do it this way. I will go along with the Members of the House if they want to cease diplomatic relations with Russia, but I would rather see something affirmatively done to stop the activities of Russia at the place they can best be stopped. Our frontier is the Karelian Isthmus today. There is no question about it. Through centuries Russia has endeavored to get to the Atlantic Ocean. She is not there yet. You can stop her at one place, and only one place, and that is at the Karelian Isthmus. It is 35 miles across. Three hundred and fifty thousand Finns can hold the line if they have the guns and the planes that they need to do the job.

Let us suppose that they cannot hold the line there. What will be the next step? The invasion of Sweden and then Norway. These countries cannot stand against the hordes of Russia. This means Russia comes to the Atlantic and she comes close to us. I have heard it expressed on all sides that we are going to help England or someone else if we help the Finns. We are helping ourselves, Mr. Chairman. It is bad enough to have the Japanese Navy in the Pacific without having a Russian Navy in the Atlantic. The natural result is going to be a two-fleet Navy for the United States; it has got to be. When Russia reaches the Atlantic our troubles begin.

If you think we can do some good by eliminating our listening post in Moscow, all right, let us throw it out, let us stop the appropriations for this embassy; but in so doing you are not going to hurt the feelings of the Russians and you are not going to stop them in the way you would like to see them stopped. I know that before the Committee on Foreign Relations there are lots of bills to aid Poland and Finland, and I am in sympathy with them. Under the Neutrality Act we cannot do much.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. EATON. What is the sense of sending powder puffs and carpet slippers over to Finland? What they need is guns to defend their women and children.

Mr. IZAC. That is absolutely right. Under the Neutrality Act the President has not yet said that a state of war exists. If we wanted to we might be able even to spare a few destroyers, a few submarines. We might even be able to send a thousand planes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Would it not be far more advantageous to send some of our American youths over there to help them withstand the assaults of the Russians? Would not that be more effective?

Mr. IZAC. No. The American people, and the gentleman himself, and I are unanimous in not wanting to permit American youth to attempt to determine the course of destiny on the European Continent. [Applause.] But if we are faced with this eventuality, does not the gentleman agree with me that the place to help stop this encroachment of the Bolshevik nation is the Karelian Isthmus?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. My primary interest is to stop the Russian Communists from plotting the overthrow of this Government in the United States. This is the first and only opportunity I have had to vote my views on this proposition.

Mr. IZAC. I wish it could be effective in that direction.

Mr. RANKIN. If American sentiment continues to rise and we continue to investigate and expose them it will be effective.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the gentleman from California see any conceivable way by which the adoption of this amendment will tend to decrease communistic activities in this country?

Mr. IZAC. I am forced to admit that I do not.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that at the last session the House passed a bill making it a crime to advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States through force or violence.

Mr. IZAC. That is correct.

Mr. WALTER. That bill is now pending in the Senate. It seems to me much could be accomplished if we could urge the Senate to act favorably on that bill and act promptly.

Mr. IZAC. This amendment, however, will not accomplish that purpose. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] is recognized.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I listened to the question asked by the gentleman from Mississippi, wherein he inquired if the passage of this amendment would decrease communism in the United States. I fail to see how merely cutting out the salary of our Ambassador to Russia would have any effect whatsoever on communism in the United States. It may have the contrary effect of stirring up the Communists and making conditions far worse so that we might have a cure that is worse than the disease.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. In just a moment.

We are paying the salary of Mr. Steinhardt. He is the Ambassador. His salary is \$17,500. Cutting out the salary of this official would not affect our relations with Russia, for Mr. Steinhardt is a wealthy man and would still continue as Ambassador. Cutting out this appropriation, however, would cause considerable embarrassment to the administration. Frankly, it would give great comfort to Stalin. At least with Steinhardt there, we have direct communication with events in Russia. We would otherwise get our information second-hand. Stalin would not mind that. He wants us misinformed, not properly informed.

I am willing to cut off relations with Russia in every conceivable way, but let us do it honestly, let us do it courageously, let us do it in a straightforward manner. Let the Committee on Foreign Affairs bring in an appropriate resolution to that effect.

Since when do we in this Chamber, or in the cloakrooms, conduct the foreign affairs of this Nation? We have a Secretary of State in whom I, and I am sure you, repose

the greatest confidence, because he is, in truth and in fact, a great Secretary of State. And how ably and excellently is Mr. Hull assisted by his aides. I have naught but praise and admiration for the wise and self-sacrificing service of men like Under Secretary Welles, Counselor Moore, Assistant Secretaries Berle and Grady, and many others whose names for the moment escape me. Has Mr. Hull authorized anyone of us to bring forward an amendment of this character? No. He would frown upon such an amendment. He would ask you to vote against such an amendment, because you cannot carry on foreign affairs in this Chamber. We do not know all the facts, we are not conversant with all the factors. The State Department every day in their diplomatic pouches get thousands of communications of which we know nothing; and until and unless we know something of this diplomatic correspondence, those private communications, we dare not in this slipshod fashion, if I may use the word "slipshod" with reference to our diplomatic relations, attempt to sever relations with another country, directly or indirectly.

I loathe Russia, I despise Stalin, I spew at Molotov, I spit upon this man Litvinov; nevertheless, I shall vote against this amendment; I want things done in an orderly and straightforward manner. Let us do all we can in a decent straightforward manner to bring about the situation I might desire or the gentlemen from Mississippi or Massachusetts might desire. Let the Foreign Affairs Committee bring an appropriate resolution. But neither of these men have, I wager, appeared before that committee.

Does the President know about this amendment? Emphatically, no. Does Secretary Hull know about it? Again, no. How ridiculous then to carry on diplomatic relations in such an emotionally forensic manner, without even the knowledge of the President or Secretary Hull.

If such a motion as the gentleman from Massachusetts presents could prevail, then what would be the use of a State Department? Let the Appropriations Committee carry on our foreign affairs.

I repeat, let us sever diplomatic relations in a decent, straightforward manner—not in this haphazard, unusual, unthinkable manner.

I now yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from New York has said that this might stir up the Communists in this country. As Cicero said of Catiline, the greatest victory we can win over them is to drive them from secret treachery to open warfare. When they get ready to rise up, the people of this country will be ready for them.

Mr. CELLER. I cannot see how in the thunder the passage of this amendment will do what the gentleman from Mississippi states it will do. It can have no such effect and I believe it will have quite the contrary effect.

If you want to do something to strike at Russia and communism, help the Finns. I had this to say the other day and I am going to repeat it:

Finland must have ammunition and implements of war to fight her battle, and even our battle, against the Communists. She asks for planes and we give her cookies. She asks for guns and we give her cake. Shall we sit in the bleachers and watch her being slaughtered in the arena of bloody Stalinism?

Let us give this aid honestly, courageously, and fearlessly to Finland and then we will be striking at Russia in a logical manner and in a way that Russia does not want.

WHY BEAT ABOUT THE BUSH? LET FINLAND HAVE LOANS FOR ARMS

Finland must have ammunition and implements of war to fight her battle—and even our battle—against the Communists. She asks for planes, we offer her cookies. She asks for guns, we offer her cake. To vary the simile, shall we sit in the bleachers and watch her being slaughtered in the arena of bloody Stalinism?

My understanding is that when the settlement was made with Finland, the amount funded was \$9,000,000, which was set up on a 62-year amortization plan, with interest at 3 percent for the first 10 years and 3½ percent thereafter.

Prior to the funding agreements Finland paid interest in the amount of \$309,315.27, and subsequent thereto she paid interest of \$4,624,443.27, a total of \$4,933,758.54. She has also made principal payments of \$957,511.23, so that payments of principal and of interest, both prior and subsequent to the funding agreements, aggregate \$5,891,291.77.

The balance of Finland's indebtedness is \$8,042,466.77 principal and \$100,423.44 accrued interest.

If we eliminate interest, Finland has paid over \$8,000,000 on a debt of \$9,000,000—practically eight-ninths of her debt to us.

She fights Soviet Russia, which owes our Government approximately \$187,730,000 and which owes our citizens approximately \$225,000,000.

Think of this—Finland has paid and retired bonds held by our citizens during the past 8 years in the sum of about \$80,000,000. If she had followed the example of Russia and other nations and refused to pay, she would have accumulated \$8,000,000 paid into our Treasury and \$80,000,000 paid to bondholders, or a total of \$88,000,000. If she had held those \$88,000,000, she would not need our loans. She could now purchase with such sum all the arms and planes she needs. She paid. Others reneged. She is entitled to special treatment.

Under the proposed arrangement, which has the White House approval, a loan of \$20,000,000 might be made by the Export-Import Bank, whose capital would be arranged for that purpose. The loan, however, would be made on the condition that the purchase in this country would not include airplanes, arms, and munitions. Under such an arrangement, what is to prevent Finland from taking the American food that she can buy with the money loaned to her and exchanging the same with other nations for such military supplies?

But why put such temptation up to innocent Finland? Where is the consistency so far as our policy toward Finland is concerned? It has been the well-recognized and well-merited rule of the State Department to refuse to recognize any territorial changes brought about by force. For that reason, we refuse to recognize the capture of Manchukuo in China by Japan; we refused to recognize Bohemia and Moravia, which were stolen from Czechoslovakia by Germany. For the same reason we could not recognize any exploitation of Finland by Russia. Why should we not help Finland against the bandit Stalin? We make speeches concerning the sanctity of treaties and international law. We have a Kellogg Treaty, to which scores of nations have been signatories, whereby we exacted the solemn pledge that they would not resort to war as an instrument of national policy. Russia has violated the letter and spirit of that treaty. She seeks to possess Finland by force. She has ditched international law. Shall we encourage her butchery by refusing aid to her victim? Shall we remain stupidly silent in the face of rapine and plunder?

Nay, more, we have sent to aggressor Japan, in her pillaging of China without let or hindrance, scrap iron, copper, lead, and all kinds of military supplies. If we can supply 85 percent of the military import needs of Japan, including planes, equipment, and American bombs to slaughter Chinese women and children, assuredly there should be a way to help the gallant Finns fight the cause of human liberty and prevent ruthless slaughter of innocents. The Finns badly need pursuit planes to fight off Russian bombers. We should help supply them.

We have loaned money to China to the extent of \$25,000,000. China is in no way one whit different from Finland, because we have refused to apply the Neutrality Act in the fracas between China and Japan.

In my humble estimation, we subscribe to international anarchy if we do not help poor and helpless Finland—and that help should mean "help." The only help worth while is arms, airplanes, bullets, guns. Cakes and cookies and sandwiches will not do much good to Finland now. I would thumb my nose at some of the psalm-singing hypocrites who agitate against sending her military supplies. The Finns today, in their heroic stand against Stalin's Communist hordes,

rank with the Greeks at Marathon, Washington at Trenton, and the Texans at the Alamo.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUNN].

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment because I believe that if it would be adopted it would be a big step toward getting our country involved in European wars. I feel extremely sorry for the poor people in Finland, Russia, Germany, England, France, Poland, and every other country in the world. If the people in the warring countries had the opportunity to vote on a war referendum there would be no wars. It is the unprincipled demagogues in every country who are responsible for the wars that are going on today.

A great deal has been said about Russia trying to overthrow our Government. I have said many times that we would not have to live in fear of our Government being overthrown by Russia or by any other power if we Members of Congress will pass legislation to provide employment for the 9,000,000 people who are unemployed and take care of the 25,000,000 people who are in need of food, shelter, and clothing.

History shows that the nations which took care of its people were not undermined by outside powers. Countries have been undermined by its own people who were deprived of freedom of speech, freedom of assemblage, freedom of religious worship, and other fundamental principles to which all mankind is justly entitled. Let us not become involved in European conflicts. Our great country will be able to do more to bring about world peace by remaining neutral. [Applause.]

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, in view of the interest that has been shown in this matter and the number of requests that have come to me, I ask unanimous consent that the time of debate on this amendment be extended 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CALDWELL]?

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, every Member on this floor knows what this amendment attempts to do. We do not have to sit here 20 minutes to get any further information. If we extend the time, it will only give those who are opposed to this amendment a chance to organize. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of debate on this amendment be extended 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CALDWELL]?

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this amendment close in 20 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we had an agreement for a half hour, which was agreeable to everybody.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order against the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDREWS. By unanimous consent it was agreed that debate on this amendment would last 30 minutes. That time will be up in 3 minutes. That is not supersedable by another motion, only by another unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition for the purpose of speaking on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, there is no Member of this House who is better informed as to the machinery of it than the gentleman from Massachusetts. He knows that every year prior to the consideration of this bill in the House weeks are spent by the committee in considering all of these matters. He has had this same feeling about the Soviet Union for years. He knows and has known that the proper and orderly procedure is to come before the committee and present his case.

Temperamentally and impulsively I am inclined to agree with all the expressions that have been made with reference to the Soviet Union. It, and everything it stands for, is repellent to me. But let us not grow wild on this subject, wave a bloody flag, and get ourselves involved any deeper in the conflict that now exists than we are.

The President on December 1 made this statement:

The news of the Soviet naval and military bombings within Finnish territory has come as a profound shock to the Government and people of the United States. Despite efforts made to solve the dispute by peaceful methods to which no reasonable objection could be offered, one power has chosen to resort to force of arms. It is tragic to see the policy of force spreading, and to realize that wanton disregard for law is still on the march. All peace-loving peoples in those nations that are still hoping for the continuance of relations throughout the world on the basis of law and order will unanimously condemn this new resort to military force as the arbiter of international differences.

Let us keep our feet on the ground and use good, common, hard sense. Ask yourselves what single good purpose can be served by the approval of this amendment? When you have asked yourselves that question, you will come to the very definite conclusion that nothing will have been done other than to provoke a great nation of the world to further excess and to involve us further in diplomatic entanglements.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. No; I am sorry I cannot yield.

It is bad policy to establish the principle that the maintenance of diplomatic relations with another government implies approval of the form of government of that country or of the actions and policies of the government of that country. If that were the case, it would appear to be necessary to consider the advisability of discontinuing diplomatic relations with several other governments now pursuing policies and objectives which the Government and the people of the United States do not approve.

The argument is not sound. You are being swept off your feet by sentimentality. You are not being logical; you are not being careful in the handling of the major affairs of this Government. You cannot afford to legislate in such a way. I insist that you want to be careful, you want to be calm, and you do not want to do anything here today that will involve this country, but you take the responsibility for doing just that if you adopt this amendment and throw the red flag in the face of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of reasons why this amendment ought not to be adopted.

No other country has broken off diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia during this recent tense period, and even the French and British Governments, although at war with Germany, have not withdrawn their diplomatic missions from Moscow.

One of the primary objectives of the foreign policy of the United States is to maintain peaceful relations with all countries. Certainly the breaking off of diplomatic relations with Russia would not be in conformity with our endeavor to maintain such peaceful relations. It is generally considered that when diplomatic relations between two governments have been severed the possibilities of dangerous and acrimonious controversy are increased through the absence of official representatives in the capitals of each country and the opportunity directly to discuss such questions as may arise between the two governments.

If diplomatic relations were broken off, in the case of Soviet Russia particularly, we would be at the mercy of propagandists and special pleaders for information with regard to that country and we would be unable to verify through our own official channels such information as might be put forward by those having special interests in the Russian situation.

Should the occasion arise for the President to be of assistance in furthering the aims of peace, it would be important to have diplomatic relations with Russia in order that his viewpoint might be accurately presented to the Soviet Government.

As far as concerns the question of communism, the severance of relations would not remove this problem from the

sphere of domestic activities in this country. It would probably drive such activities underground. The matter of dealing with communistic activities in this country is a problem of domestic concern and is at this time being well handled by the Government and local authorities, as has been shown by recent events.

Let me call your attention finally to one feature that has already been mentioned in the Committee of the Whole.

Diplomatic representatives are often more necessary and can do more during periods of tense relations with a foreign country and are often more useful and necessary in those periods than when the relationship with that particular country is easy and on a more amicable basis. During periods of tense relations, the presence of a diplomatic mission becomes essential for the protection of American citizens and property in the other country.

As long as we have officials in Russia we have eyes and ears there, and we have the means of being of some assistance to American nationals. When you take the Ambassador and your foreign officials away, you leave every American national in Russia at the mercy of Russia, and then we have no implement to assist them, we have no means of knowing what is going on over there, and we have no means of protecting our interests, and our interests in Russia are major. To sever relationships will simply damage us and cannot help us. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired; all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FISH, and Mr. DUNN) there were—ayes 88, noes 86.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. McCORMACK and Mr. CALDWELL.

The committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 105, noes 108.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out line 9, on page 6.

Mr. Chairman, the vote just taken indicates that a large number of the Members of this House, nearly a majority, are in favor of severing diplomatic relations with Russia. While the vote was not taken on that specific issue, I am sure that if the Committee on Foreign Affairs would bring out a resolution and give us a direct opportunity to vote on the question there would be an overwhelming sentiment in this House for such action. [Applause.]

Some have said that no aid should be given to Finland because it might involve us with Russia. Just what aid are we now giving to Russia? We in the United States are making it possible for Russia to get \$35 an ounce for every ounce of gold that is produced in Russia at a cost of \$12 an ounce. We are taking Russia's supply of gold and are paying them a premium of tens of millions of dollars every year. Therefore, instead of making loans to Russia, we have given them outright gifts out of the United States Treasury and from the American people with which to buy war supplies and other materials to destroy our friends in Finland.

What more are we doing to help Russia? We are subsidizing the exports of our wheat and other agricultural commodities, and we are paying bonuses and subsidies to Russia so they may get wheat with which to feed their soldiers and supplement other necessary supplies.

Therefore, there is no reason in the world why we cannot aid Finland and help these courageous men and women in their fight for the preservation of the democracies of the world against the dictatorships. We should take action in this House to provide that friendly aid which will be of material assistance to them, rather than give aid and succor to the enemy. I hope the Committee on Foreign Affairs will bring out a resolution that will make possible the necessary aid to Finland.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOOK. For the gentleman's information, I may say there is a bill before the Ways and Means Committee providing for the authorization of a loan to Finland and I wish the Ways and Means Committee would act on that bill now.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The Ways and Means Committee could, but someone has said here today that we cannot aid Finland on account of our neutrality law. Well, we are giving aid to Japan under our neutrality law and we are giving aid to Russia because Russia has not been declared unfriendly to the United States. But for some reason or other there has been a cooling off process among some of the administration leaders as to a loan for Finland. I hope that these leaders have not been intimidated by Russian representatives. It is our business to discontinue that unholy alliance we now have with Russia.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Neutrality Act is not involved, because that act has never been invoked with respect to the conflict between Russia and Finland.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No; or as far as Japan is concerned; because we could stop the war in China within 60 days if we would stop the shipment of war supplies to Japan; but for some reason—maybe we are not in on the hidden secrets of the State Department—they take no action to help our friends in China, and now they are cooling off and about to take the same attitude toward that friendly country of Finland, after they have met their obligations to us and are one of the few surviving democracies of the world. We can give material aid to Finland without becoming involved in the European war. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I have listened with great interest to the speeches that have been made here today in connection with the conduct of the Soviet Republic in world affairs. I heartily agree with the denunciation that has been uttered as to the actions of the Soviet in its relationship with other countries. I deplore the events that have resulted from Russia's repudiation of every promise and agreement.

In my opinion, it is equally important for us to discuss the happenings in our own country on the part of public officials which, in any way, may transgress upon the rights of our citizens. Recently, in the Federal court of the eastern district, 17 men were arraigned and each one was held in \$50,000 bail. Although these men were charged with a serious crime against the Government, bail in the amount of \$50,000 is certainly excessive. I do not believe there is any precedent for such exorbitant bail, especially in view of the excellent records of most of the arrested men. However, I am not personally concerned with this phase of the case because I do not know any of the individuals, nor do they live in my district. My interest in the matter arises out of the conduct of our Government officials after the arrest. I believe what then happened to these men was a definite violation of their constitutional rights as well as an occurrence which we would very loudly protest if it were permitted in a foreign country. I refer to the publication of their pictures in a recent issue of a weekly magazine in such a manner as to seriously reflect upon the men. This magazine published a complete front view and a side view of each arrested man and across the chest was an identification tag indicating that the picture was taken by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The release of these pictures, printed in a publication, evidently with the approval and consent of the Department of Justice, was grossly unfair to the arrested men and a practice which has no sanction either in law or in common decency.

My only purpose in discussing this matter today upon the floor of the House of Representatives is to direct the attention of the Congress to this situation, with the hope that the

practice of the Department of Justice in making available for publication in the press pictures of an arrested person will be stopped. Under our Constitution every man is considered innocent until proven guilty, and we should do everything possible to protect that right. I appreciate the attention and interest of the House in my talk, and I hope that as result of our action here today we shall see this vicious practice immediately discontinued. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words—"\$17,500 each."

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] did not prevail. I will agree it was not the proper procedure, but it was the only opportunity this House has had or is apt to have to express its will on the recognition of Soviet Russia. We cannot report out any bill from the Foreign Affairs Committee, because the administration dominates it and is against it, and it could not come before the House in any other way than it came just now. I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] will offer a motion to recommit, so that every Member of the House may have an opportunity on a roll-call vote to go on record whether he is in favor of severing diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. I do not think the gentleman meant to say that anybody dominates the rank and file of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. FISH. No; I will change the word to "influence," if that will satisfy the gentleman, because, naturally, under any administration the Secretary of State has influence and should have influence with the majority on any committee, particularly Foreign Affairs, and I assume that would be so under a Republican administration. I know it has been, and I know it is likewise true under your administration.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. As one member of the majority party and a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I would welcome more frequent meetings of that committee in order to take up these important matters. I think it is a crying shame—

Mr. FISH. Oh, the gentleman knows that three or four bills have been introduced to sever diplomatic relations with Russia, and that we have not had a hearing on one of them.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

Mr. FISH. And I think the gentleman will find that the State Department is against such a hearing, and I think that he will find also that is the reason we have not had any hearings. The gentleman is a member of that committee, and is a member of the majority party, and he should try to have such a hearing.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. On page 17 of the bill I will offer another amendment. There is no need of offering one on page 7 now in view of the action of the House just taken.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I wish the chairman of the subcommittee, and the minority ranking member of the committee would pay attention, and I ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] to also give his attention to these remarks. I do not know whether it is the intention of the committee to leave out Belgium. Belgium, as I understand it, has an ambassadorial status the same as 10 or 11 nations, and I think it should be included in this bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. I do not know what question the gentleman has asked me.

Mr. FISH. Oh, I see that Belgium is in a separate clause by itself, on lines 12 and 13.

Mr. RAYBURN. My reaction to this whole thing is that the House of Representatives is not the place to settle our diplomatic or foreign affairs when we have duly constituted authorities to do that very thing.

Mr. FISH. We have the power to do so, and I hope the House will always exercise that power.

Mr. RAYBURN. I hope the House will never do it in this way.

Mr. FISH. In its own judgment and wisdom after discussion on both sides of the proposal. I have moved to strike out the last two words, "\$17,500 each" for the purpose of asking why the American Ambassadors from England, from France, and from Belgium have been brought home. Can it be that they have been brought home just on the eve of the outbreak of the full fury of the European war to tell the American people that the British subjects and the French citizens and the Belgian citizens are in favor of a third term? So far all we know from those Ambassadors is that they have made public announcements in America that they are in favor of a third term because of the danger of swapping horses in the midst of a European war. If they are to earn their \$17,500, it seems to me that they ought to be at their post of duty in the midst of this war.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. EATON. I rise to ask if the gentleman received an answer to his question as to why Belgium is left out of this list?

Mr. FISH. I find that it is taken care of in lines 12 and 13, but I have had no answer why our Ambassadors to London, Paris, and Brussels are here in America while being paid \$17,500 each to serve our country at their posts abroad.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I rise to make a few observations that I hope will be given consideration. I do not suppose anybody in this House fails to appreciate how important, how delicate, and how dangerous is this subject that we propose to deal with right now. This is one of the major diplomatic matters that this Government will be called upon to deal with perhaps in many, many years. If there ever was a time when American statesmanship ought to have its feet on the ground and its head on its shoulders it is right now. Insofar as I am concerned, I do not know how it is with the body of the membership of this House; I never heard of this proposition to sever diplomatic relationship with Russia until about 15 or 20 minutes ago. Just think of the spectacle of the great American House of Representatives passing on a question of this sort all "het" up and with their eyes shining. When people's eyes are shining it is no time to pass on great questions. Think of the speeches that we have listened to, undertaking to stampede this House now, in this critical hour of our Nation's life. Let me make you one or two suggestions, and you just think about them. I do not know so much about what is in the books. I know something about what the books are written about. I have observed life. I have observed the operation of the laws of cause and effect. The adoption of this resolution could not hurt Russia. Its reasonable and probable result would be to help Russia. You are familiar with the history of the French Revolution. Outside opposition was the most solidifying influence exercised upon the French people. We are supposed to be opposed to bolshevism in America. I ask you, out of your own experience, what is the most solidifying influence that can be exercised on any people? It is outside opposition. We are giving to these dictators in Europe what those dictators could not possibly command—outside opposition, the most solidifying influence that can be exerted on a divided people. Take the history of the French Revolution. I do not think anybody can study the French Revolution and not know that the thing that drove the French back upon themselves in solidarity and made it possible for them to fight the battles of the Revolution and carry them through the Napoleonic wars, and almost enabled them to whip the world, was the

fact that as soon as they declared their Revolution, outside people began to attempt to influence the policy of France.

I do not think anybody can study the Russian revolution and fail to reach the conclusion that there was no force or influence within that country which could possibly have held together that divided people, of all races and religions and tongues, until they could have consolidated that revolution, except for the economic pressure which this country and other countries began immediately to bring to bear upon them. I am just talking common sense now. We are dealing with a practical matter.

I remember my grandfather told a story one time about a man going down the road and he saw a man and his wife fighting. He, the outsider, tried to intervene, and they turned on him and almost beat him to death. [Laughter.]

Do you want to know why we have got just one party in the South? Every time we show a disposition to split up, you Yankees threaten to do something to us, the cracks close up, and we have just one party. [Laughter.]

I am talking sense now. This is a practical proposition. If we want to help bolshevism, this is the way to do it, because we give their leaders all the excuse they will need for the failure of their policy. They say, "Look what those capitalistic nations are doing." They do not need any better excuse than that. All the excuse we have in the South is, "Look what those Yankees are trying to do to us," and we do not need any further argument. [Laughter.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I want you to think about this thing now. This is no small matter we are dealing with now. It does not fall within the group with reference to which partisan politics may be excused.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EATON. We all have the greatest affection and regard for the distinguished gentleman, but what is the logic of the position that the gentleman is now taking? It must be that the American people must draw themselves into a spiritual and intellectual vacuum and have nothing to say about what is going on in the rest of the world.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. No; it is not quite that. There is definite conflict between sentiment and judgment. When you get to a conflict between sentiment and judgment you are in a bad situation, and it is difficult to handle. I admit that sentiment is fine in its place, but whenever sentiment climbs up into the judgment seat and undertakes to determine policy, it is a mighty dangerous time for the people of the Nation. [Applause.] Sentiment performs a good office when it calls judgment to the judgment seat, but sentiment makes a bad mistake when it misunderstands its natural limitations and undertakes to speak the voice of judgment. Please think that over.

Mr. EATON. I would like to answer that.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. No; I will not let the gentleman answer that. I do not want the gentleman to spoil that good statement of mine.

I doubt that Hitler could have consolidated the revolution in Germany but for the solidifying help from outside opposition. That made it impossible for the opposition to him in Germany to do anything about it, speaking practically. In my view—and I mean no offense—this proceeding is the sort which cannot add anything to our diplomatic strength and certainly nothing to the confidence of the Nation in the fitness of the House of Representatives to guide and guard the interest of the Nation in this, one of the most tragic, dangerous periods in all the annals of time. It is a pitiable, pathetic thing. What do we propose to do? We propose to cut off the pay of a fellow we have got hired over there in Russia and think that is going to have something to do with the war. Now, Members of this House, do not do it. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that cutting out the appropriation for our embassy to Russia at this time would be a roundabout, indirect manner of accomplishing what a great many people of the United States would like to have done. This is to give some substantial assistance to that heroic nation on the other side of the world—Finland—which has aroused the admiration of the entire American people by its splendid fight to maintain its national integrity against the onslaught of one of the most colossal nations of the world. Russia is attempting to invade Finland and subject it to its own desires in order to secure a base whereby they can disseminate their political propaganda throughout the world more easily.

I agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. Izac], when he stated that our frontier is on the Karelian Isthmus. It most certainly is and the sooner we recognize this fact the better. The war which is going on in Finland today is only a part of a general campaign which has been carried on by Soviet Russia to spread its political ideology all over the world. They have attempted to spread it in this Nation by every other means, except the force of arms. They are attempting to spread it in Finland by force of arms. If we are going to lend any assistance to this nation in its hour of need, this assistance must not only be timely, but it must also be substantial. All the statements that have been made that the neutrality act now on our books bars us from lending any assistance to Finland, are entirely erroneous. There is nothing in the neutrality act which would bar us from lending assistance to Finland. War has not been declared and the Russians themselves have announced that they are not waging war in Finland. They are merely going into Finland to the assistance of the People's Party. They, by their own admission, are not waging war. They are only engaged in a neighborly act of kindness. They have also announced to the League of Nations that they are going into Finland in order to prevent England and France from seizing a base in that territory. They have announced to their own people that they are engaged in defending Russia from Finnish invasion.

Now I submit to you that the situation in that part of the globe today is exactly this. Russia is going into Finland, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. The Bear has his eyes fastened on that territory today as he has had for centuries. So if Norway, Sweden, and Denmark do not join Finland to beat Russia, they will be defeated in detail, and the only way they can effectively combat the threat of Russian invasion is to actually invade Russia. In no other way can the Scandinavian nations win the war. As soon as the weather becomes milder, the Russians can and will bomb every city, town, and village in Finland and reduce it to ruins. They will bring up the necessary heavy artillery tanks and transportation and force their way into Finland to actually occupy the territory and force the Finns into subjection. The small force of the Finns will fall from sheer exhaustion. Then the Russian hordes will sweep across the Scandinavian peninsula and also Denmark.

In order to win, the threatened nations must invade Russia and destroy the bases from which the bombing planes and armies are operating. This must be done either by land or air or by a combination of the two. Wars are not won by defensive operations. Effective combat of bombing planes can only be accomplished by operating against the bases from which they are serviced. If we are to furnish assistance to Finland, it must be substantial enough to enable them and those who must be their allies to wage the war as it must be waged to win. Any assistance short of this would be a mere gesture of friendship, foolish and futile. They too must understand that they cannot win unless they invade Russia and destroy the will of the Russians to wage war. This is not at all impossible because of the internal condition of Russia as regards transportation facilities and general morale.

I call the attention of the membership here this afternoon to the fact that we are not nearly so far away from this

conflict as we might seem to be. Iceland is only a few hundred miles from that place, and Iceland is only a few hundred miles from North America. It is a direct link in the chain, and Russia has her eyes fastened on it.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. KELLER. Is there not a better way of doing what the gentleman and all America wants to do? That is to give the Finns all they need. Then they will take care of themselves. [Applause.]

Mr. FADDIS. That is exactly what I am trying to propose here this afternoon, that we adopt a common-sense practical way of assisting the Finns by giving them what they need to maintain their independence. By so doing we are also helping ourselves. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I want it distinctly understood that my attitude on this proposition is not prompted by any European war. I am looking at it from an American standpoint. I am opposed to any government that attempts to overthrow the Government of the United States, and I am for driving from American shores every influence that comes here and attempts to destroy my Government. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] overlooked one fact: Geographically, Russia is closer to us than any other European country, for she lies just across Bering Strait from Alaska.

Let me answer the distinguished gentleman from Texas. In the course of his remarks he spoke about the world's turning against France after communism had brought on the French Revolution, and about forcing the French to solidarity. What I am trying to do today is to bring some solidarity among the American people to fight communism and drive it out of this country. He talks about what they did to Germany. I will tell you what happened to Germany. The Communists flooded in there by the thousands, took control of Germany, destroyed the German Republic, and created Hitler. Do you want them to create a Hitler here? We are going to have to stop these communistic influences in the United States, and this is the only opportunity that I have had to vote to that effect.

I heard witnesses before the Dies committee. I heard a Negro testify that he had been sent to Russia and trained in the technique of revolution of waging war against the white people of the United States for the purpose of overthrowing this Government and waging war on the white people of the South. They have taken young white people, as well as Negroes, to Russia and trained them for that purpose in flagrant violation of the treaty by which we recognized the Soviet Union.

I am looking at this matter from an American standpoint, not from a Finnish standpoint, not from a German standpoint, not from an English standpoint, but from the standpoint of my own Government created by Washington, defended by Jackson, perpetuated by your people and mine; and I shall cast my vote at every opportunity presented on the floor of this House to drive these iniquitous influences from American soil. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad that all of us here are speaking for America. Our opinions differ, but we are for America, and we ought not, any of us, to doubt the stand of any other Member of this body or of the American people on that subject. There is now pending a motion to recall the American Ambassador from Russia.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] set out the fundamentals of the history that all of us ought to know and observe under present conditions. It seems to me that if we only look closely and carefully at what is taking place in Europe we can defend and promulgate our Americanism to the very best possible advantage by recognizing our duty

to the little Republic of Finland by supplying them with the things they need with which to defend themselves. Any man who knows the border between Russia and Finland will tell you that if they are supplied with arms, ammunition, and airplanes, which they have a perfect right to have from us under our Neutrality Law, they can defend that border until Russia will be thoroughly sick of the war that they are forcing upon that little nation, 40 Russians to 1 Finlander. It is a shameless scene, one that shocks every man with a drop of sporting blood in his veins and people all over the world. If those countries that we call civilized support the Finns only so far as to provide them with arms and munitions, Russia will break to pieces over this merciless, this brutal attack. That part of Russian ideology that ought to be eliminated from the world will be eliminated when the Russian people awaken to what the Stalin government is doing to Finland. Finland is giving to the world the best example of courage and manhood that has been seen in a hundred years. The people of America are abundantly able and abundantly willing to give to this people what they have got to have to defend themselves.

There is no danger in our being drawn into the war in doing this. Russia has not only not declared war on Finland, but denies that she is making war on Finland. There is nothing in our own neutrality law, under these circumstances, that at all limits our right to lend money or sell war equipment of all kinds to Finland. No reasoning American will deny these are our rights, and none but a "Mr. Milque-toast patriot" would fear to act on those rights.

That will do the thing we are all driving at.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman know if the Secretary of State or the President is making any effort to get Russia to lay off of Finland?

Mr. KELLER. I do not know about that because I have not talked to them.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does not the gentleman think they should do something about it?

Mr. KELLER. I think everything has been done that can be done and I think everything will continue to be done that it is possible to do. However, there is this delay which we have in our own body and in another body. We are talking a republic to death while a brave people are begging only for arms and equipment with which to defend their country and their lives.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If they have done everything they could do, they have not done anything.

Mr. KELLER. They may not be able to do anything.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The administration is delaying action in the House.

Mr. KELLER. In relation to Finland?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes.

Mr. KELLER. So far as helping Finland is concerned?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes.

Mr. KELLER. I have not heard that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman heard the President's message the other day?

Mr. KELLER. I did; but I did not get that from it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is what it said.

Mr. KELLER. That is not my opinion of what it said.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman feels that Russia is the aggressor in this matter?

Mr. KELLER. There is no question about that.

Mr. KEEFE. Is the gentleman aware of the fact, as reported in the press of a couple of days ago, that a thousand young people met in New York City to choose delegates to the American Youth Congress and passed a resolution condemning Finland for being the aggressor and accusing it of starting this war upon Soviet Russia?

Mr. KELLER. I regret to admit that there are likely even more than a thousand young jackasses loose in New York. I am glad the gentleman does not belong to them

nor endorses what they are doing when they do things like that. I am as much for helping Finland as any man can be, and I am as much for giving them their chance to show up the shortcomings of Russia as any other man. Let us give them the money and give them airplanes. I repeat, we are under no obligation to withhold aid from Finland. There is no war. There is nothing in the neutrality law which will limit our Government so far as Finland is concerned. We should rise up and take action at the present time to give that little republic exactly what it needs. It will do the rest. You need not worry about that; it is not fighting its battles alone. Every man in those Scandinavian countries is on his tiptoes ready to help. In the next few weeks more than 50,000 men from Scandinavian countries, who know that climate, and are as good soldiers as there are in the world, will be helping Finland. We should give them ammunition and the equipment that men take with them into the defenses of that kind.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to make a speech at this point, but we have spent considerable time on this particular section, and there will be ample opportunity for debate as the bill is read. I am wondering if we cannot read the bill for a short while, then have the debate continue? We are anxious to finish up this bill tonight, if possible; however, I have no desire to shut off anyone who has a speech to make, but I thought these speeches might be made a little later.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask one other question of the gentleman from Illinois in order to follow through the thought that was expressed in the first question I put to him. It was reliably reported in the press that a group of about 1,000 young people met in New York to choose delegates to the American Youth Congress, which is meeting here in Washington. It was further reported that of this group only 5 voted against a series of resolutions which condemned Finland and gave support to Soviet Russia, thus very clearly demonstrating their interest and affection for the Soviet Government of Russia.

Mr. Chairman, the delegates from that meeting came to the meeting of the American Youth Congress; and appearing in the press this morning is this statement, headed:

MRS. ROOSEVELT DEFENDS COMMUNIST RIGHTS IN GROUP

A White House debate, in which Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt defended inclusion of Communists in the American Youth Congress, was divulged yesterday on Capitol Hill.

Then follows the report of that meeting held at the White House, to which numerous Members of Congress were invited, and which they apparently attended, because Senator JOSH LEE is quoted in this article as being in absolute opposition to their arguments. Senator WHEELER, of Montana, is also quoted similarly as disagreeing with "Mme. President." The Senator, who is frequently mentioned as a possible Presidential candidate, said this:

Where will you get with conservatives if we liberals are opposed to you?

There is the picture. These people came down here from New York after attending a meeting such as I have described and are invited to attend a meeting at the White House where the rights of these young Communists are applauded as being part and parcel, and rightfully part and parcel, of the American Youth Congress. I want the spokesmen for the White House to know that so far as I am concerned I oppose vigorously, as did the representatives of this body and the Senate who attended that meeting, the inclusion of the Young Communists League as representative of the American youth of this Nation. When that matter comes before the House at a future time, I assure you I am going to present the result of a very long investigation on that subject.

I am in favor of the principles of the N. Y. A., but I want it sent out to the country today that there should not be any connection between the N. Y. A. and the American Youth

Congress. Those who are purporting to speak as representatives of the American Youth Congress in support of the N. Y. A. had better keep their mouths closed, because they are serving to discredit that organization and its splendid work rather than doing it any good.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KELLER. Will the gentleman read the resolution to which he referred as having been passed in New York?

Mr. KEEFE. No; I do not have that resolution here. Everybody here saw it in the press. It was published in the papers. I will get it and put it in the Record if the gentleman wants it.

Mr. KELLER. Yes; I should be very glad to have the gentleman do that. I should also like to make this remark—that if it misrepresents the sense of that meeting, as this newspaper article does the sense of the meeting at the White House, it does not carry very much weight.

Mr. KEEFE. I have no knowledge that the newspaper article misrepresents the sense of the meeting at the White House.

Mr. KELLER. It does.

Mr. KEEFE. I am informed that the press were barred from this meeting at the White House, and that what appeared in the press this morning was given to the press by those who attended as members of this conference.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to paraphrase a little the remark of the gentleman from Illinois—and I think he will agree with me and say that jackasses are welcome as members of this Youth Congress.

Mr. KELLER. I said that the gentleman was not guilty of being one.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to restrict unnecessarily the latitude of debate, but we are going to try to finish this bill today, and we should like to move along. I suggest that we read several sections before we have any further debate under pro forma amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That no salary herein appropriated shall be paid to any official receiving any other salary from the United States Government.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to propound an inquiry to the members of the committee which has reported this bill. It seems that members of the committee in charge of the bill opposed the McCormack amendment on the ground that we should not recall our Ambassador from the Communist Soviet Union because we should retain him as our listening post in Moscow. What I want to find out is why this bill, as reported out, includes an annual appropriation of \$17,500 for an Ambassador to the Government of Germany, notwithstanding the fact that the New Deal administration for many months has not seen fit to have an Ambassador in Berlin, Germany. I cannot understand why the New Deal administration finds it necessary to have an Ambassador in Communist Russia and unnecessary to have one in Germany.

Mr. CALDWELL. I may say to the gentleman that that is an administrative matter over which this committee has no control.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. This clearly indicates that the argument advanced in opposition to the McCormack amendment was not based on a sound principle. If it is necessary to maintain an Ambassador in the Communist Soviet Union in a listening-post capacity, it surely is just as essential to maintain an Ambassador in Germany for the same purpose.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard many eloquent talks today in favor of taking sides in foreign wars and furnishing sinews of war to one side at the expense of the almost bankrupt Treasury of the United States. We now have a national

debt of more than \$42,000,000,000. Our Federal Government for many years has been running several billion dollars in the "red" each year. In addition to our stupendous national debt of more than \$42,000,000,000, we have about seven or eight billion dollars of obligations which have been guaranteed by our almost bankrupt Federal Treasury.

With more than 11,000,000 American people out of employment and our Government, in the name of economy, reducing expenditures for feeding our hungry unemployed Americans and reducing the expenditures for the relief of our distressed American farmers, it is absolutely un-American and indefensible to continue to play Santa Claus to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars for people in foreign lands. Are we going to our American people and point out that in the name of economy we reduced W. P. A. appropriations, we reduced essential appropriations for the relief of our distressed farmers and other distressed American citizens, in order to balance the Budget and be in a position to play Santa Claus in a big way and hand foreign nations many millions of dollars to carry on their wars? As sure as night follows day, as soon as we take sides and finance foreign wars it will not be long before American youth will again be slaughtered on foreign battlefields under the wave of propaganda which is now sweeping America as it did prior to our entering the last World War.

With reference to aid for Finland, if these multimillionaire newspaper owners—such as the owners of the Washington Star, Kaufman and Noyes, who have been demanding that we raid our almost bankrupt Federal Treasury to finance wars of foreign nations—are sincerely in favor of helping those foreign countries, why do they not raise a private fund and contribute a million dollars each and call upon their fellow multimillionaire propagandists who feel as they do to do likewise? They should then go to multimillionaire new dealers—who are as liberal with the American taxpayers' money as they are—and solicit a contribution of a million dollars from each of the hundred or more multimillionaire new dealers who are the main cogs of the New Deal political machine which plays Santa Claus to foreign countries in a big way, as the Democrats always do when they are in power. Let them go to Doris Duke and Jimmie Cromwell, who contributed \$50,000 in order that he might be appointed Minister to Canada. Go to Barney Baruch, the multimillionaire New Deal unofficial president; go to President Roosevelt, Mr. Morgenthau, Mr. Edison, Harold Ickes, and the other 125 multimillionaire New Deal liberals, who are very liberal when it comes to spending other people's money.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this Congress will serve America. We are Members of the American Congress. Let us devote our best efforts and energies to the welfare of our own country and our countrymen. Let us keep out of foreign entanglements and stop playing Santa Claus in a big way to those in foreign lands, and stop financing their wars, particularly since our Federal Treasury is almost bankrupt. Furnishing dollars and other sinews of war to a nation engaged in war is not neutral. It is an act of war which will result in again sending our men to slaughter on foreign battlefields. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on November 30, 1939, I addressed a letter to the President of the United States and also to the Secretary of State, requesting that the United States break off diplomatic relations with Russia in the best interests of the people of the United States of America, in order that we as a nation may not be placed in an embarrassing position with regard to any diplomatic relations with Russia, and I suggested that an order be issued recalling our Ambassador to

Russia and that all diplomatic relations with Russia cease at that time.

Subsequent to this, on January 3, I introduced a bill calling for an authorization of a \$60,000,000 loan to Finland for the general requirements of that Nation.

I fully realize that the breaking off of diplomatic relations with Russia would not lend material aid to Finland. Why do I say that we should give Finland material aid? Because of the fact that, if Russia should be able to crush Finland, she would then be in a position to move into the northern part of Europe. She would then be of some use to Germany and Hitler, and until she crushes Finland she will be of no use to Hitler or Germany. If she becomes of use to Hitler and Germany, and they join together and take over the Balkans and move to take over Norway and Sweden, a totalitarian government will reign throughout Europe. This type of government will be in complete control of Europe, and when they do, the very foundation of democracy in this country will be in danger.

If we give this aid to Finland, it is not going to be just an ordinary gift, it is going to be a loan, but at the same time it is going to be more than that. It is going to be an insurance policy to this Nation against the invasion of those godless elements in this Nation and the best insurance policy that we can have.

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield.

Mr. SECCOMBE. I appreciate the gentleman's friendly sentiments toward Finland, but would the gentleman mind stating whether he received a letter in return to the one he sent the President?

Mr. HOOK. I received a letter in reply with the information that was presented on the floor today, that they needed a listening post in Russia, and that they would be in a better position to be able to sit in on a peace conference and aid Finland in that way and protect her if they had an Ambassador than if they did not have one.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOOK. Yes.

Mr. MOTT. There is a matter I think the gentleman might clear up, in view of the sentiment in this House in favor of a loan to Finland, which is a reflection, I think, of the sentiment all over the country, as to why no move in that direction has been made. The gentleman is aware, is he not, that the only reason the Foreign Affairs Committee has not gone ahead with the consideration of this bill is that that committee has 15 members of the majority party and 10 of the minority, and the President has not given the Democratic members of that committee a green light on the matter.

Mr. HOOK. I know nothing about that. I know nothing about any green light from the President. I do know the President and this administration will and are giving their support to aid to Finland. They will act as soon as the Ways and Means Committee brings out this bill before them.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman knows the President has not expressed his approval to the committee.

Mr. HOOK. I know the bill is not before the Foreign Affairs Committee; it is before the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. MOTT. Such a bill is before both committees.

Mr. HOOK. The bill I introduced provides for a \$60,000,000 loan for the general requirements of that country, and can be made in accordance with ordinary channels of commerce between countries; and if we do not allow that, we are putting a premium on aggression.

Mr. MOTT. There is such a bill before both committees, I will inform the gentleman—the Ways and Means and Foreign Affairs.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Foreign Service buildings fund: For the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of the act of May 25, 1938, entitled "An act to provide additional funds for buildings for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments of the United States" (52 Stat. 441), including the initial alterations, repair, and furnishing of buildings acquired under said act, \$300,000, to remain available until expended, and in addition the Secretary of State is authorized to enter into contracts for such purpose during the fiscal year 1941

in an amount of not to exceed \$100,000: *Provided*, That whenever a contract is made for the construction, alteration, or repair of a Foreign Service building which requires payments in a foreign currency, the Secretary of State is authorized to purchase such currency at such times and in such amounts (within the total amount of the payments to be made under such contract) as he may deem necessary, the currency so purchased to be disbursed and accounted for at its cost price: *Provided further*, That this authorization shall also apply to the funds available to the Secretary of State under prior appropriations for the construction of Foreign Service buildings.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that there has been no debate on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. O'NEAL). To what paragraph does the request of the gentleman from Florida refer?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I am agreeable to that request. I really rose, Mr. Chairman, to consume the time of the Committee, because I was looking for the gentleman from Massachusetts. I did not know the gentleman was here.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there has been no debate on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I took this time because in looking for the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack], who is to propose an amendment on the next page, I did not see him sitting here, and I took the time in order to protect his rights. As long as I have the time I shall use it to discuss the same subject that has been before the Committee—namely, the recognition of Soviet Russia. When Soviet Russia was recognized by the President of the United States certain very definite promises were made to the American people, and, as other speakers have already said, most of those promises have been repudiated. These Communists are the most skillful propagandists in the world, so when they wanted America to recognize Soviet Russia they dangled before the eyes of the American people, and particularly of big-business men and the international bankers in New York State, a great juicy bait, and said, "If you will recognize Soviet Russia, we will do \$1,000,000,000 worth of business with you"; and the big bankers and the internationalists and the businessmen, and the industrialists all jumped on the band wagon for recognition. They then went down south into the Southern States, where cotton is king, and said, "If you will recognize Soviet Russia we will do \$200,000,000 worth of cotton business with you; we will buy \$200,000,000 worth of cotton from the Southern States"; and the good old Methodists and Baptists of the South, who hated Russia because the Soviets had denied and repudiated God and all religion and spread class hatred and world revolution—those good Baptists and Methodists, when the bait of \$200,000,000 worth of cotton was dangled before their eyes, put aside their scruples and their consciences and also jumped on the band wagon and had their Senators and even their Representatives favor the recognition of Soviet Russia.

So this bait won over the international bankers and the industrialists of the North and the cotton people of the South, and then what happened? Recognition was granted, but instead of doing one billion worth of trade they did \$25,000,000 worth of trade in a year, and under Republican administrations prior to recognition the facts will show that we did \$100,000,000 worth of business with Soviet Russia. Since recognition we have done \$25,000,000 worth of annual trade with Soviet Russia. Instead of buying \$200,000,000 worth of cotton from the Southern States they bought, I think it was, three and a half million dollars worth of cotton, and they borrowed that money from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to put over the deal. But the skillful propaganda, based on business hopes, appealed to the South and appealed to the Northern States, and the promise of an

enormous amount of trade won over those who were in opposition to recognition. Now, after 7 years of complete failure to live up to any of their promises or pledges, particularly those promises for increased trade, is it not time for the Congress of the United States to act? I admit that this is not the proper procedure, far from it. There is not a Member on either side of the House who believes that this is the proper procedure, but it is the only chance we have. If we want to sever diplomatic relations, this is the only hope, the only way that we will ever have in this Congress to express our views and our sentiments and our solemn convictions. Is there anything wrong in Republicans or Democrats seizing this opportunity to express their views and the views of their constituents who want to sever diplomatic relations and have nothing to do with this country that denies God and spreads revolution all over the world, including the United States of America? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Not to exceed 10 percent of any of the foregoing appropriations under the caption "Foreign intercourse" for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, may be transferred, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to any other foregoing appropriation or appropriations under such caption for such fiscal year, but no appropriation shall be increased more than 10 percent thereby: *Provided*, That all such transfers and contemplated transfers shall be set forth in the Budget for the fiscal year 1942.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK: Page 17, after line 14, insert: "*Provided*, That no appropriations contained under the caption 'Foreign intercourse' shall be used for the maintenance of an embassy of the United States in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or for salaries or any character of expense, other than salaries, for the maintenance of any office or officer of the United States State Department in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the vote taken on a similar proposition to this a short time ago was very close—105 to 108. I am serving notice now that if I can get the floor I shall move to recommit the bill, with instructions to report the bill back forthwith with the amendments adopted. The pending amendment brings flatly before the Committee again the question that I attempted to bring when I tried to have the three amendments considered together. If the chairman of the subcommittee had agreed to that, the debate would have been over and settled by the vote taken on the first occasion.

Mr. Chairman, the very fact that 105 Members in the Committee voted in favor of this proposition indicates a very strong feeling in support of the effort that I am making on this occasion. I dare say that of the 108 Members who voted against the proposition, every one is opposed to what Soviet Russia stands for.

However, I wonder if they realize they were not consulted when the Litvinov agreement was entered into. The question of the recognition of Soviet Russia was not submitted to the Senate of the United States. Now, when they talk about "sentimentality," they are rather inconsistent in their position, because we were not consulted on that occasion, and this is the only opportunity we have of acting in our own right in expressing our views and the views of our constituents on this important matter.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I did not talk with Secretary Hull. [Laughter.]

Mr. MASSINGALE. That is what I wanted to ask the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know. I told the gentleman privately and the gentleman told me he was going to ask me the question. I anticipated it by telling the gentleman that I did not.

Mr. MASSINGALE. That is what the gentleman told me.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, someone talks about being "taken off our feet by sentimentality." The sentiment is on the part of those who have a fear of communism, who have

a fear of the Soviet Union. I hear some of them talk about Finland. I will vote for a loan to Finland without reservation. I will vote for a loan to Finland to buy munitions and implements of war. If we can loan money to Finland under the guise of Government credit for the purpose of buying agricultural products, we can make a loan to Finland for any purpose, without reservation.

We hear those who oppose the amendment talk that way, but certainly they did not vote the way they feel. They talk about Finland. If we took action today, it would be a message which would be chronicled throughout the world. It would do more to inspire the courageous people of Finland, short of other real material assistance, than anything this country could do.

Soviet Russia has broken every promise it has ever made. It never has kept a promise. I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] that the Karelian Peninsula is the front-line trenches for western civilization. That is what I assume he had in mind. The Finns are making battle against those vicious forces that are not only desirous of conquest, but are determined to destroy the origin of western civilization—religion itself. When the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] made his statement, I assume that is what he had in mind. If so, I thoroughly agree with him.

Mr. FADDIS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. My good friend, the gentleman from Texas, Judge SUMNERS, said if we wanted to help the Bolsheviks this was the way to do it. I respect my distinguished friend, but I remember when I was before the Committee on the Judiciary trying to get a bill out to make it a crime for "a person to knowingly and willfully advocate the overthrow of government by force and violence." I could not get it out of his committee. That amendment was put onto another bill last year, you will remember. I could not get it out of the Committee on the Judiciary to make it a crime for anyone "to knowingly and willfully advocate the overthrow of government by force or violence."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not ask for legislation confining it to "advocate." My bill provided that anyone who "knowingly or willfully advocated." What American can be opposed to that bill? Of course, the Committee on the Judiciary is composed of fine men and sincere, but I could not get that bill out of the Committee on the Judiciary. I wonder how some of my friends in the House on both sides feel when they realize that statement; and yet, when the amendment was offered in the House, it was overwhelmingly adopted. It reflected the sentiment of the Members of this House. It reflected the sentiment of the people of the United States.

There is no official diplomatic recognition of Russia. It is semidiplomatic, simply an exchange of letters, and it only exists by sufferance. The President can recall the Ambassador any time he wants to. This is not a question of whether there has been official recognition by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I yield to my friend.

Mr. KERR. Why did not the distinguished gentleman come before our committee and make a statement with respect to this legislation and sit down quietly and calmly with us and talk it over and see what could be done about it?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a perfectly proper question. Of course, in the first place, I have a hesitancy about appearing before committees when all I know is what has been testified to after the hearings are over and printed. I recognize there might be some logic for that. But the Committee on Appropriations is not like any other committee. My experience is that they do not hold public hearings like any other committee.

Furthermore, a Member is not compelled to appear before a committee. A Member has his own rights as a Member of the House. To be frank with my friend, you know, and

I know, that if I appeared before the committee it would have been useless. The subcommittee would not have made any recommendation. I knew it had to be done by the House. The quicker our Ambassador is recalled from the Soviet Union, either by this action or by the President, the better for our country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of heat generated here on a question which I think is very important and which should be determined upon practical consideration of facts rather than prejudice or feeling. No Member of this House has any greater conviction of hostility against communism both here and abroad than myself. The question pending before us, however, is not whether communism is good or bad; not whether the United States acted wisely or unwisely in recognizing Russia; not whether Russia kept her promise or broke it; the sole question now to be considered is whether or not the severance of diplomatic relations at this time and the withdrawal of our Ambassador from Russia at this time will help or hurt the United States of America. [Applause.] Any other argument on any other line begs the question and is an appeal to passion and prejudice. I appeal to the House in passing upon this important question which affects not only our own country but Finland as well, to use our sound, sober judgment.

The chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bloom] is confined to his bed with illness and cannot be here. As a member of that committee I may say to the House that the question now pending is one to which I have given some thought and consideration. I am not acting upon impulse in what I say but upon an investigation of the facts with reference to the effect this resolution may have. I say candidly, and I say it with all the earnestness of my soul, that the adoption of the resolution to withdraw recognition of Russia and withdraw our Ambassador at this time will hurt the United States of America and will hurt Finland. [Applause.] If anybody challenges my statement, I would like to hear from him right now.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. BARRY. Is the gentleman in favor of withdrawing our Ambassador from Germany?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. No; I am not, and we have not done so. We have not withdrawn our Ambassador from Germany. He is here on temporary leave.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Who is here on temporary leave from Germany?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Our Ambassador to Germany.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman mean our very able former Ambassador, Mr. Hugh Wilson.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand he resigned as Ambassador.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I am not sure about that, but I do know he came home on leave. At any rate, the Embassy in Germany is not vacant, and we have representatives in Germany now carrying on our Embassy in Berlin.

If we withdraw our representative from Russia, what do we do? What will it profit us and how will such an act benefit Finland? Our Embassy and Ambassador to Russia not only looks after the rights of American citizens but we are also enabled to get the facts as to what is happening there. When we had no representative in Russia our Government had to depend upon hearsay as to what was happening. One party would bring one report and another party a different report, and the State Department was in doubt as to the true condition of affairs in Russia. Now, with a war raging and with conditions as they are, more than ever before in our history do we need diplomatic representatives there; and we have as our Ambassador to Russia a very able man who, I am told

by the State Department, is doing a splendid job in representing us and getting the facts and in looking after our interests.

It is important also that we maintain our Embassy in Russia so that this Government, having its representatives there, can get information and facts for our Government to use in its dealings not only with that country but other countries. So far as Finland is concerned, you are not helping Finland—you are not helping the United States at this critical time—by severing diplomatic relations or withdrawing our Ambassador.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Is it not a fact, since the gentleman and myself and most of us do not want to do anything that would be helpful to Russia, that the withdrawing of our Ambassador from Russia would be a blow at our own interests?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Absolutely. We would simply be making a gesture—a foolish gesture and a dangerous gesture—that would have no practical effect in the way of hurting Russia. We would be hurting only our own country, and we would be hurting Finland.

Do you think this is the place, do you think this is the forum, as an amendment to an appropriation bill to consider whether the relations of our Government should be severed, where the matter cannot be discussed, nor its significance, with all the facts, brought before the House? Do you think we should vote upon a matter of this kind when we do not know what the effect will be? I think I know what the effect will be, because I have investigated this question from every angle. Unlike my good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], with whom I usually agree, I have been to the State Department and I have obtained information from sources which cannot be questioned outright. I am sure if some of the Members of the House had, they would not have voted as they did today, because the effect is going to be hurtful rather than helpful.

Mr. EATON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. I agree with my beloved colleague on the committee that this is probably not the best way to do it, but he made the statement that if this amendment is agreed to, it will injure the United States of America. I wish he would tell us in a few words exactly how that will be done.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. That is a very reasonable question. In the first place it will hurt us because we will have no diplomatic representative over there to look after our own citizens who may be there at this very critical time. It will hurt us also in that we will not know what is happening in Russia so that we can gage our conduct with Finland and other countries accordingly. In this grave crisis it is necessary that we find out all the facts we can at this time. In time of peace it may not be so important to have a representative, but in time of war when other countries are threatening and no one knows what will happen, it is highly important that we have our Ambassador there to get all of the facts, to determine our conduct and relations to Russia and the other countries of the world. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CALDWELL]?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want 5 minutes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 50 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CALDWELL]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the very tense feeling that any Member of Congress or any American citizen might have over the situation that has been discussed here today. I do not believe anyone will accuse me of being particularly sympathetic with the Communists when they recall the fact that I have already been burned in effigy twice in public squares by the Communists in New York and some other places for the activities of the W. P. A. investigating committee in seeking to rid our relief rolls of Communists and their influence. It seems to me when we, sitting in the Committee of the Whole, more or less in an ex parte manner, by the control of small appropriation items, undertake to fix or seriously influence the foreign policy of our country, we are getting into very deep water and on very dangerous ground.

I heard some gentlemen here today advocating this drastic and significant action who on other occasions were inveighing against alleged tactics by the administration which they claim were seeking to put America into war; yet I cannot think of anything that the Congress could do; I do not know of any way we could commit a greater affront to a nation that as a power at present is on friendly relations with America, than by the action which is proposed here in this amendment.

If the question in issue here were whether or not America would recognize Russia, then I nor any of my colleagues would have any difficulty in voting on the question. Of course, you would not recognize it. The attitude of that Communist country, the manner in which it has persecuted all religious denominations, the manner in which it has ground down its own citizens and taken their rights away from them, the outrageous invasion of Finland, and all of its other acts are repulsive to every impulse of liberty and freedom that any red blooded American citizen could have, yet there is a proper time and place in which to fix the important foreign policies of our country, and this is not the time nor the place. Whatever may be our attitude toward some policies of the present administration, I believe the one man who has handled his job above reproach is Cordell Hull. In a most critical period, fraught with grave danger, he has done a magnificent job in handling the foreign affairs of this country [applause], and it seems to me that the action which we are proposing here today in withholding a small appropriation for the Embassy at Moscow is most untimely, and impugns the administration of our Secretary of State. I want to plead with the House of Representatives not to take snap judgment on this matter. It is not a question whether we approve or disapprove of Russia's invasion of Finland. Of course we do not. There would not be a vote in this body to approve of that. As has been pointed out, the suggested action would in nowise aid Finland or injure Russia. There is a proper time, a proper place, and a proper forum under our system of government in which these matters of foreign policy are determined and handled, and not collaterally by taking out a small item of an appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, I very much hope that this amendment and any other similar amendment will not be accepted by the Committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

RECOGNITION OF RUSSIA

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the tribute paid by the gentleman to the administration of the Department of the Secretary of State, but I believe we should also be informed whether or not it is a fact that the files of that Department will show that every one of our representatives in Europe concerned with the Russian situation immediately prior to its recognition recommended against recognition of Russia at that time. If that is a fact it seems to me it has a very material bearing upon the policy with which we are here concerned. I say this because the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Texas and others,

are doubtless accorded the privilege of knowing what were the reports of our representatives on the borders of Russia immediately prior to our recognition of this regime.

RUSSIAN GOLD

I want to address myself more specifically, however, to the theory of the listening post in Russia. We have been hearing a great deal recently about the matter of Russian gold. The Secretary of the Treasury states that he does not know and is utterly unable to find out how much Russian gold is being produced or what is its distribution. I want to suggest that if our Ambassador in Russia is not able to learn these facts there is within the bounds of the United States now a gentleman who for 9 long years up to 1939 was in charge of all Soviet gold production.

Why is this a matter of concern? If it be a fact that this Government has taken \$1,000,000,000 of Russian gold in the last 5 years, as is by many asserted, it means that we have not only given that amount of exchange to Russia but we have given the Soviet Government a profit of hundreds of millions of dollars. It is estimated that Russian gold may be produced in vast quantities for less than \$15 an ounce. Yet we pay \$35 an ounce for every ounce shipped to our shores from anywhere in the world. This means that in buying \$1,000,000,000 in gold the United States gives Russia a profit of approximately \$600,000,000 for gold that probably could not be sold elsewhere—certainly not at any such price.

JOHN D. LITTLEPAGE

John D. Littlepage is the name of the gentleman to whom I refer, whose book, *In Search of Soviet Gold*, reveals the most intimate knowledge of gold production in Russia throughout the last decade.

It is no answer to the suggestion that America has been financing Russia through this period to support this communistic regime to say that all the gold in our Treasury is stamped with the mark of Britain, France, or the Netherlands. This may simply mean that Europe has sold us a billion dollars' worth of European gold and replaced that gold with a billion dollars of gold from Russia, to maintain Europe as the international gold broker, which in my judgment is actually the fact.

Mr. Littlepage sought to discover why Russia did not increase its production of gold. He was told by an international authority on finance, as he reveals in the book to which I have referred, that Russia did not dump more gold on the world market because Europe thought the United States was now taking about its limit, and they did not wish to kill this golden goose. These international gold buccaneers have dumped gold on our country until we now have 65 percent of all the gold to be found in all the world.

I would suggest that the Secretary of the Treasury seek out Mr. Littlepage to tell us a few elemental facts about Russian gold production and distribution, since our Embassy seems unable to ferret out the truth.

I would not say that our novel gold policy was designed to bolster the tottering economy of Communist Russia. That, however, has been one of its unfortunate effects. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MASSINGALE].

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, I was quite a bit surprised at the vote on the first amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], whom I admire very much. Since the beginning of the debate on this amendment the gentleman from Massachusetts has very frankly told us that he has not consulted Secretary of State Hull about this matter at all. With that frank statement it is impossible for me to conceive why any man, whether he be a Democrat or a Republican, would want to commit this Congress upon so important a matter without even consulting the man who is charged with the responsibility of handling that Department of the Government of the United States.

I can say one thing, however. We have a gentleman on the Republican side who seems to act as the minority Secretary of State. He never misses an opportunity to get up here and say something about the foreign policy of the United States.

Even between sessions of the Congress he makes trips across the ocean and when he gets there rides in airplanes to the various countries that are at war or about to get into war, and then comes back here and announces what the foreign policy of the Government of the United States ought to be.

At one time I believe I spoke of the gentleman—and I have a very high regard for him—as a Secretary of State in waiting. If he is not that, I do not know how to describe him. He is not satisfied with Secretary Hull's administration of the foreign policy of this Government. I hope he will be patient enough, at least, not to unhorse Mr. Hull now, but will wait until after the November elections, when perhaps he may realize that long-nursed ambition of his to direct the foreign affairs of this country.

As I stated a while ago, it seems quite absurd for this Congress to adopt this amendment, notwithstanding the very high regard and affection we all have for the author of the amendment. It is just too dangerous for us to be fiddling with an action such as this without some advice from someone who is responsible to this Government and knows what ought to be done about it. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I was greatly interested in the statement of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], that if we had a chance to vote at this moment on the question whether or not we should recognize Russia, there would be no question about the result of the vote. That statement has gone forth to the administration, that without question this House would go on record, if they had a chance to vote on the question properly, that we would not approve recognition of Russia. Therefore, his argument seems to be that it will be too bad to deprive our Ambassador of his salary. This is the one forum we have for expressing ourselves on these matters, so what harm is there, even in this back-handed way, in our taking this action? If we had an opportunity to vote on the question directly, the gentleman says we would express ourselves as against it. Then why not do it this way? I doubt very much if that gentleman over in Russia finds out anything the Russian Government does not want him to know.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ALEXANDER. If the Ambassador in Russia is so necessary or essential or valuable, or is doing such a good job, why was it impossible for the commander of the *City of Flint* to contact him at the time his ship was tied up in the harbor at Murmansk?

Mr. GIFFORD. I believe everybody understands that our Ambassador to Russia finds out nothing that the Russian Government does not care for him to know. They are undoubtedly making a mountebank of him.

The point I wish to make, however, is that this is the only way we have of expressing ourselves. I have no hesitation in saying that if all it amounts to is refusing the salary of that gentleman, let us do it. I might remind the House that if we vote it out, we do the job. If we wanted to let him stay there at his own expense, we probably could not accept his services. I do not know but that probably some of you might want to vote to leave \$1 in this appropriation in order to make him a dollar-a-year man, so that he can represent us legally if he stays there.

A gentleman who preceded me said they could not find out how much gold Russia had imported. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve say we have not bought an ounce of gold as such, but we have only taken it in ordinary business transactions. Indirectly we have taken the gold; everybody knows that. Russia can buy our securities and then sell them the next day and take our good dollars for them. We do not have to buy gold as such from Russia. It is difficult, you know, to listen to explanatory speeches founded on simple facts from the Federal Reserve and from the administration. We have to look into them very care-

fully and learn the indirect results obtained. Of course, Russian gold indirectly has found its way here, and we have helped finance her war in Finland.

I am not afraid. I want to extend help to Finland. I am ready to vote direct aid. I repeat what I once quoted here not long ago in the words of Daniel Webster:

Three thousand miles of ocean roll between; we are safe; but we belong to the family of nations.

Can we not at least protest? If my vote here today could only be interpreted, I would like to have you interpret it as "Hurrah for Finland!"

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Does not the gentleman think that even before we withdraw the money for the Ambassador to Russia we ought to withdraw the money for the Ambassador to Berlin, who is not even serving.

Mr. GIFFORD. Well, we cannot explain that situation. To fully comment on the many peculiar actions of this administration would take a long time. [Laughter and applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure if we were taking a poll expressing opposition of Congress to bolshevism or communism, it would be practically unanimous, but, unfortunately, this legislation does not permit of such a poll today.

I cannot help but think of the inconsistency of the arguments we are making today compared with those we were making less than 6 months ago, when discussing the neutrality bill. The gentleman who preceded me referred to the withdrawal of our Ambassador from Russia, and a number of others have expressed their individual opinions about the matter. If it were left to me personally, I would not have had any Ambassador in Russia to begin with, but that is a matter heretofore left with our President or State Department, and while I recognize we have the right to make or refuse to make an appropriation for such a diplomatic post, I think it is nothing short of our duty that we try to maintain friendly relations with all nations.

Less than 6 months ago men stood in this Chamber here and pleaded, with tears in their eyes as big as little apples, for the passage of a neutrality law in order to keep this country out of war. They were pleading in response to the will and desires of the American people that this country should take no action that would involve us in a foreign war; and yet we hear some of these same gentlemen here today—the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], for instance—rising on the floor of this House and saying that he is now willing to vote to supply and send arms and munitions of war to Finland, a country that is already in war. There is no doubt but that such action would be a flagrant breach of our neutrality law, which he so ably defended and supported last year. In other words, he is willing, by his statement and actions today, to take the first step that will inevitably lead us into a foreign war. I would not dare question his motives, but when he speaks of sending arms and munitions to a country already in war, which would be in violation of our neutrality law, I cannot overlook the fact that he comes from a State in which there are large shipbuilding interests and many munitions plants.

I have unbounded sympathy for Finland, and I have no sympathy whatever with the Government of Soviet Russia or any of its social or governmental teachings or institutions. As a matter of fact, I would personally like to see every vestige of communism or Russianism wiped off the face of the earth, but I am not willing at this time to take an unprovoked action that may involve us in war and require us to send millions of young men into a foreign country and sacrifice their lives simply to satisfy my personal likes or dislikes. There can be no doubt but that the passage of this amendment will be a reflection and an insult to Russia. As I have already stated, I hold no brief for Russia; I have no sympathy whatever for Russia or any of its institutions; but

I know that one of the easiest ways in the world to get into a fight is to slap an enemy in the face.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. CREAL. Does the gentleman recall, when the same gentleman from Massachusetts made his speech last year on the neutrality bill, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] said, "That is the most warlike speech we have had since the World War"?

Mr. HARE. I do not recall the exact language, but I do know the two gentlemen referred to were then on opposite sides of the neutrality question, and the gentleman's observation is just another concrete illustration of the inconsistency of their actions here today.

We cannot fool the American people about getting into war. They want this country to stay out of any and all foreign wars, and they do not want this Congress to go around with a chip on its shoulder giving dares to people simply because we do not like the way they do things. Sooner or later it will get you into trouble. To withdraw diplomatic relations with Russia now simply because we do not approve of her form of government or the way she acts toward other nations—we would for the same reason be compelled to withdraw diplomatic relations with Germany, Japan, and other foreign countries, which we know sooner or later will mean war for us. Of course, if there is anything to be gained, I would readily be willing to cut out this appropriation of \$17,500, but I am not willing to take the chance of becoming involved in a foreign war on account of so little an amount of money. That is, I am not willing to take the chance of sending the young men from my district to a foreign war for the pitiful sum of \$17,500, which is the amount involved in this amendment. It is not worth the sacrifice of the life of even one man.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago, when the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC] stated that he favored the extension of loans to Finland for the purpose of purchasing military supplies, I interrogated him and asked whether he thought it would not be more effective to send American youth to help Finland fight against the onslaughts of the Russian armies. I did not propound that question because I was in favor of that step, and I want it distinctly understood at this time that I am opposed to extending aid to Finland for the purchase of military supplies, because I believe to do so would be an unneutral position and would ultimately lead to our involvement in the war which is now raging in northern Europe.

I voted against the McCormack amendment because I believed that to take such action at this time, to withdraw our diplomatic representative from Russia, would be an unneutral act, and I am opposed to doing anything at this time which is inconsistent with the neutrality policy which was adopted by Congress during the special session.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Is not the breaking off of diplomatic relations the first step toward war?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Whether it is or not, I am opposed to breaking off diplomatic relations with any country at this time, believing that the United States should take a distinctly neutral position and not become involved or influenced in any way by our emotions or sympathies.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to call the attention of Members here to history. There was probably no more bloody revolution in recent times than the French Revolution, and yet within 3 weeks, I believe it was, at least it was only a few weeks, Washington and Jefferson, two men we highly regard in the United States today, recognized the Republic of France. Why? Because it was a de facto government. By recognizing a government you do not thereby approve what they do or what they stand for. You simply say that that is a de facto government, and therefore that we recognize it. We recognized the czarist regimes for decades. Did we thereby approve what the czars stood for? Of course not. Now, if we

are going to sever diplomatic relations with Russia, it must follow that we must also sever diplomatic relations with Germany; but I do not hear these gentlemen from Wisconsin or my good friend from New York [Mr. FISH] who rode in von Ribbentrop's airplane saying that we should sever relations with them, and yet the Hitler government denies God. Hitler has abused us and denounced democracy. When he raped Poland and laid it waste, did these gentlemen take the floor to denounce him? Then we must also sever relations with Italy. When Mussolini ravaged Abyssinia, did these gentlemen arise to protest? The Governments of Russia, Italy, and Germany are all alike, and we must treat them all in the same manner.

Mr. FISH rose.

Mr. HILL. I have not the time. Because Germany and Italy have done the same as Russia, and we have the same thing against Germany and Italy that we have against Russia. I cannot yield. In conclusion may I read from two esteemed gentlemen. I am not very much of an admirer of the great Al Smith, but at least you cannot call him a Bolshevik or say he favors communism. On page 1543 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 12, 1933, he is quoted by Senator Borah in this manner:

Russian propaganda in this and other countries is also offered as a reason against recognition. I don't know how widespread Russian propaganda is, and I don't believe anyone else knows. In fact, there is considerable doubt as to whether the Russian Government actually is attempting to undermine other governments. If so, I am not afraid of what it will accomplish here.

And then to my Republican friends I quote from that distinguished statesman whose keen mind and unquestioned integrity we all honored and whose funeral I had the honor of attending in Boise. Senator Borah, who was chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, had this to say:

If I did not believe in the intelligence and the patriotism of the people of the United States, I might be afraid that they would be misled by propaganda of that kind; but as I do believe in their intelligence and patriotism I have no such fear whatever. I am not willing to base our foreign policies upon the theory that our own people are weaklings, susceptible to every intellectual wind that blows.

May I say, my good friends, that if we in this country set our house in order and solve the farm problem and the unemployment problem, bolshevism and nazi-ism and fascism can get no hold in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the gentleman who just spoke wants it to go into the RECORD that the German people are antigod, and I do not believe any other Member of Congress believes that the German people have repudiated God; and if that is what he said, and he wants to keep it in the RECORD, it is his privilege to do so, but I am sure that that is not what he meant.

Mr. HILL. Does the gentleman deny that Hitler denies God and religion?

Mr. FISH. I never had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Hitler or discussing religion with him. I am talking about the German people and that is what the gentleman said. The German people believe in God just as much as the gentleman does, just as much as the American people believe in God. It is an entirely different thing, recognizing Russia that has repudiated God and all religion and teaches hatred of God and all religion, and Germany.

Mr. HILL. The Russian people have not.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman will find out about the Germans, and what they think in America, the people of German origin, as to whether they believe in God, and whether they think their relatives believe in God.

I never have defended Hitlerism. I was the one who introduced the first resolution against the persecution of the Jews by Hitler. I never, never said that I was in favor of Hitler or any foreign dictatorship, and I want that to go into the RECORD. I never defended any foreign dictatorship—never. I

am more against dictatorships than any man in the House, and I am just as much against dictatorship at home. [Applause.] I am against a dictatorship in Russia the same as I am in Germany or in the United States. It is none of our business what form of government exists in Germany or Russia, but very much our business that there is no kind of dictatorship in our own country.

I am getting a little tired of these references to "rides in airplanes," when even Prime Minister Chamberlain, Premier Mussolini, and others rode in the same airplane, and an American Congressman cannot travel in the plane of the German Foreign Minister without having his patriotism and Americanism impugned. I do not know what the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL] did in the World War, either. [Laughter.]

This question of recognition of Soviet Russia is no new matter. It was an international lie from the beginning. It was when we recognized Soviet Russia. It is still, and it will continue to be as long as the Communists are in control of Soviet Russia. As I have said, it is none of our business what form of government they have in Soviet Russia or in Nazi Germany or in Fascist Italy, and it is none of their business what form of government we have in the United States of America; but it is our business when foreign nations, like Communist Russia, interfere with our free institutions and republican form of government. It then becomes very much our business to prevent the spread of communism in our own country, and we intend to make it our business, and on every opportunity I have to sever diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia on that ground alone I propose to take it. The opportunity is here in the House of Representatives. Have we got the courage to take it or will we say, "Wait until some other time," as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] said. "This is not the time. This may be harmful to us." What good is an Ambassador in Soviet Russia? What good was our Ambassador when the *City of Flint* was seized? He could not even communicate with the captain of the *City of Flint*, who was at Murmansk for a week. What good is an Ambassador there? What does he know about the production of gold in Soviet Russia and the sale of gold to us at twice or three times the cost of production? It has been said it would be harmful to Finland. How in the world could it be harmful to Finland to repudiate Soviet Russia now? That is what I want to know. That is what the American people have a right to know. If you send out word that the majority of this House has voted to sever diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia, nothing could help Finland more in its fight for independence and liberty and encourage them to continue their battle for democracy and Christianity.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not think, if it should go out that this Congress voted unanimously, after this question came up, much as we deprecate the fact that it has come up in this way, but if it should go out that we voted unanimously against this amendment, every newspaper in Russia will say that we had endorsed and recognized and approved the Russian policy?

Mr. FISH. Certainly. It is too bad it has come up now, because if it is voted down that will be the effect in spite of the fact that 90 percent of the American people want to have nothing to do with Soviet Russia.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to appear on the floor so frequently. When you listen to one of these calm, deliberate speeches like we have just listened to from the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] [laughter], and see and appreciate that the statesmen of a great Republic have assembled deliberately to consider a major matter such as we are now considering, and then when a fellow makes a

fiery speech like I am making, it is just out of order. [Laughter.]

This is one of the most remarkable proceedings I have observed since I have been a Member of this House. On the spur of the moment, by an amendment to an appropriation bill, with reference to which no prior notice has been given, it is proposed, in effect, to sever diplomatic relations with Russia. Now, what do you propose to do? We have a lot of talk about bolshevist and Finland. I have not heard anybody here get down to cases and state what benefit is going to come to any of the countries with whom we sympathize as a result of the action here proposed, or what harm is going to come to Russia if this amendment is adopted. Our Secretary of State, our diplomatic agent, struggling with all the involved diplomatic problems arising out of many nations at war, is not even consulted. Just think about that for a minute—grown people charged with a great responsibility actually proposing to do this thing. I am very certain that the only benefit that will come to anybody will come to Russia if we should pass this amendment. We are not going to do anything to them, but the Russian leaders would immediately be able to appeal to their people that they should stand together, because this great Government is undertaking to run the business of Russia. Can anybody overestimate the benefit of such an appeal? Suppose this were reversed, what would our reaction be? This is one of the most remarkable situations I have ever seen. Here we have a system of three coordinate branches of the Government. We have a man—Cordell Hull—employed by those people to have responsibility, in the first instance, for taking care of our diplomatic arrangements. I am not going to embarrass the people who have been voting to take this control away in the first instance by asking how many of them have sat down in calm, deliberate discussion with Cordell Hull and suggested to him that this thing should be done. I venture the statement that there is nobody, and if there is anybody, I will yield for him to stand in his place and say so. I will not exclude my distinguished friend who is a candidate for the Presidency of the United States on the Republican ticket. I yield to him to state that he went up there to the Department of State and gave his views to the Secretary of State that this thing ought to be done.

We are saying to the world today, at a time when Cordell Hull is the only person in the first instance to handle the diplomatic relationships of this country, that we are undertaking to take that responsibility away from the Department of State in the first instance; that we have no confidence in the Secretary of State. The only thing we do is to weaken the hands of the Secretary of State in undertaking to deal with the difficult and dangerous problems of this country at this moment. I will venture that you cannot find in the history of this country anything comparable to what is taking place in this Chamber right now.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would the gentleman inform us where Secretary Hull was when the arrangement was made for recognition of Russia?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Unfortunately, I do not follow him around all of the time. I do most of the time, but that was one time when I was not on the job.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the gentleman recall that Secretary Hull sailed for South America and the President himself made the arrangements with Litvinov after Hull had departed.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not know where he was. One very significant thing about this whole matter apparent to me and to everybody else is that somehow or other on the Republican side you followed a little too regularly a certain gentleman from Massachusetts on this thing. It looks a little like politics, and this is a mighty poor time and place to be playing it.

Mr. JOHNS. Rubber stamps?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. No; I would not say rubber stamps.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with my colleague from Texas that this is an amazing situation. There never has been a time in my 27 years of service in this House, it matters not who was the President of the United States or who was Secretary of State, when in a proceeding like this I would have voted to abrogate the ancient and fundamental policy of the Government of the United States in foreign affairs.

The outcome of the question now before us cannot be put upon the ground of what we think about Russia, what we think about the form of government in Russia, or what Russia has done to the little democracy of Finland. This action here today will not help Finland. This action here today will not hurt Russia. Let me repeat what was so well said by my colleague from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], that this action will make a more determined and a more resistless Russia to go about doing more of the things she should not do.

Are we, the Congress of the United States, going to sever diplomatic relations by an amendment like this with every country on the face of the earth with whose form of government we do not agree? Do you endorse the Government of Japan? Do you endorse in toto the government in Italy, or in Germany, or in a dozen other countries throughout the length and breadth of the world? Whether or not some people wanted the United States to resume diplomatic relations with Russia, it has been done, and done by the people who had the authority to do it.

It is dangerous ground, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, upon which we tread today. The international situation is tense, and I was so impressed by the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MASSINGALE], buttressed by the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]. Is there a man in this House who has spoken in favor of this amendment, or who intends to vote for it, who has given the Secretary of State the privilege, the poor privilege, of talking to him or her about not only the Russian situation but the situation in other parts of the earth and with other countries?

I do plead with my colleagues at this hour: Be mighty careful, it is a dangerous situation that faces the whole earth. Let us, therefore, not do a thing here in passion and lack of reason that might embarrass this country beyond the poor limits of the patience and fortitude of the people of the United States. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CALDWELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, all I care to say about this amendment is that now we have mauled it around, knocked it about, and played politics with it we ought to do the sensible thing and vote it down. No one has offered a single reason why it should be approved. No one has pointed to a single benefit which will accrue to this country if it be adopted. There must be a limit beyond which prejudice and politics cannot go.

I urge the defeat of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McCORMACK) there were—ayes 38, noes 95.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For payment of the annual contributions, quotas, and expenses, including loss by exchange in discharge of the obligations of the United States in connection with international commissions, congresses, bureaus, and other objects, in not to exceed the respective amounts, as follows: Cape Spartel and Tangier Light, coast of Morocco, \$1,176; International Bureau of Weights and Measures, \$4,342.50; International Bureau of Publication of Customs Tariffs, \$1,318.77; Pan American Union, \$239,458.70, including not to exceed

\$20,000 for printing and binding; International Bureau of Permanent Court of Arbitration, \$1,722.57; Bureau of Interparliamentary Union for Promotion of International Arbitration, \$20,000, including not to exceed \$10,000 for the expenses of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, stenographic reporting services by contract if deemed necessary, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5), traveling expenses, purchase of necessary books, documents, newspapers, periodicals, maps, stationery, official cards, printing and binding, entertainment, and other necessary expenses to be disbursed on vouchers approved by the president and executive secretary of the American group; International Institute of Agriculture at Rome, Italy, \$48,756, including not to exceed \$11,700 for the salary of the American member of the permanent committee (at not more than \$7,500 per annum), compensation of subordinate employees without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, expenses for the maintenance of the office at Rome, including purchase of necessary books, maps, documents, and newspapers and periodicals (foreign and domestic), printing and binding, allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, as authorized by the act approved June 26, 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a), for the use of the American member of the permanent committee, and traveling and other necessary expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State; Pan-American Sanitary Bureau, \$58,522.75; International Office of Public Health, \$3,015.63; Bureau of International Telecommunication Union, Radio Section, \$5,790; Inter-American Radio Office, \$3,655; Government of Panama, \$430,000; International Hydrographic Bureau, \$5,404; Inter-American Trade-Mark Bureau, \$14,330.20; International Bureau for Protection of Industrial Property, \$1,471.63; Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, \$50,000; *Provided*, That hereafter, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of the act of May 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 491), the report of the operation and work of the laboratory, including the statement of the receipts and expenditures, shall be made to Congress during the first week of each regular session thereof, such a report to cover a fiscal year period ending on June 30 of the calendar year immediately preceding the convening of each such session; American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood, \$2,000; International Statistical Bureau at The Hague, \$2,000; International Map of the World on the Millionth Scale, \$50; International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts, \$6,745, including not to exceed \$6,500 for the expenses of participation by the Government of the United States in the meetings of the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts and of the commissions established by that committee, including traveling expenses, personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, stenographic and other services by contract if deemed necessary, without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5), rent, purchase of necessary books, and documents, printing and binding, official cards, entertainment, and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State; Convention Relating to Liquor Traffic in Africa, \$55; International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, \$4,332, including not to exceed \$800 for the necessary expenses of the Commissioner to represent the United States on the Commission at its annual meetings, personal services without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, printing and binding, traveling expenses, and such other expenses as the Secretary of State may deem necessary; Permanent Association of International Road Congresses, \$588; International Labor Organization, \$163,511.64, including not to exceed \$5,901 for the expenses of participation by the United States in the meetings of the general conference and of the governing body of the International Labor Office and in such regional, industrial, or other special meetings as may be duly called by such governing body, including personal services, without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, stenographic reporting and translating services by contract if deemed necessary, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5), rent, traveling expenses, purchase of books, documents, newspapers, periodicals, and charts, stationery, official cards, printing and binding, entertainment, hire, maintenance, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State; Implementing the Narcotics Convention of 1931, \$10,551.85; International Council of Scientific Unions and Associated Unions, as follows: International Council of Scientific Unions, \$19.30; International Astronomical Union, \$617.60; International Union of Chemistry, \$675; International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, \$2,316; International Scientific Radio Union, \$232.40; International Union of Physics, \$62.72; International Geographical Union, \$125.44; and International Union of Biological Sciences, \$154.40; in all, \$4,202.86; and Pan American Institute of Geography and History, \$10,000; in all, \$1,093,000, together with such additional sums, due to increase in rates of exchange as the Secretary of State may determine and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury to be necessary to pay, in foreign currencies, the quotas and contributions required by the several treaties, conventions, or laws establishing the amount of the obligation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language beginning in line 20, page 20, "International Labor Organization, \$163,511.64" and ending on page 21, line 11, with the words "Secretary of State" on the ground there is legislation contained in lines 1, 2, 5, and 10.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have an additional point of order.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that points of order be taken up separately.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve another point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language beginning with the word "Bureau", line 2, page 18, and ending with the word "group" in line 15, page 18.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the Chair tell us what point of order is before us at the moment?

The CHAIRMAN. There are two points of order pending. The gentleman from South Dakota raises a point of order against the language beginning in line 20, page 20, and ending with line 11, page 21.

The gentleman from New York raises an additional point of order against the language beginning in line 2, page 18, down to and including line 15, ending with the word "group."

Does the gentleman desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I do.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I think legislation is clearly included in the lines I cited.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard?

Mr. CALDWELL. May I ask that we take up the points of order one at a time?

The CHAIRMAN. We will take up the first point of order raised by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that here is legislation in an appropriation bill. The language provides that certain things shall be done "without reference to the Classification Act" and certain other things shall be done "without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes," and it also includes this language: "And such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State," all of which is legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CALDWELL] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CALDWELL. I think undoubtedly some of the language in that section is subject to a point of order. I am wondering if the gentleman would object to the elimination of the objectionable language.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against all of the language in the portion of the bill cited. From what I have heard of this particular item, under the appropriation made last year, as many as four trips to Europe were made, and other things done which seem of questionable justification. Consequently, I am constrained to make the point of order to include the appropriation itself.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida desire to be heard further?

Mr. CALDWELL. Undoubtedly a portion of the language is subject to a point of order, but I think the purpose can only be accomplished by the inclusion of that language. I certainly cannot object to sustaining the point of order on the ground suggested by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. The Chair will now hear the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] on his point of order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language I previously referred to on the ground

it is legislation in an appropriation bill and covers items not authorized by law.

Mr. CALDWELL. Would the gentleman have any objection to eliminating the language complained of, which is subject to a point of order, and retention of the substance of that section?

Mr. TABER. I cannot agree to that because I do not believe the language I have included within the point of order serves a useful purpose. I believe that the Bureau of Inter-parliamentary Union should be done away with. It is not justified, and we should not in these days when economy is necessary have the item in the bill. I believe the House ought to vote on it separately if we are going to have it.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, may I ask that the point of order be again stated to the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] makes a point of order against the language beginning in line 2, page 18, down to and including the words "American group," in line 15.

Mr. TABER. All of the language between those two points.

Mr. CALDWELL. Undoubtedly some of that language is subject to a point of order, and I cannot object to the Chair sustaining the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an authorization in there, but there is also legislation in an appropriation bill. The Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk, the language of which will take the place of that stricken out on the point of order raised by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CALDWELL: Page 20, line 20, after the figures "\$588" and the semicolon add the following: "International Labor Organization \$163,511.64, including not to exceed \$5,901 for the expenses of participation by the United States in the meetings of the general conference and of the governing body of the International Labor Office and in such regional, industrial, or other special meetings as may be duly called by such governing body, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, rent, traveling expenses, purchase of books, documents, newspapers, periodicals, and charts, stationery, official cards, printing and binding, entertainment, hire, maintenance and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and such other expenses as may be necessary."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it contains items that are not included in authorizations of existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, the language of the amendment I have proposed follows the purpose of the act of June 19, 1934, which provides as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby authorized to accept membership for the Government of the United States of America in the International Labor Organization, which, through its general conference of representatives of its members and through its International Labor Office, collects information concerning labor throughout the world and prepares international conventions for the consideration of member governments with a view to improving conditions of labor.

The powers included in the proposal are all necessary and incident to the authority granted by the act referred to. Our membership in the organization cannot be properly accomplished except under the authority conveyed by that language.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any authorization for entertainment in the act to which the gentleman has referred?

Mr. CALDWELL. I believe it is perfectly obvious, Mr. Chairman, that entertainment is a necessary incident to the carrying out of the purposes of the act. Considering the objective desired to be attained and the purpose of the passage of the legislation, I think it must be admitted that

our participation in the conference cannot be successful without it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is constrained to give a liberal interpretation to the act referred to by the gentleman from Florida, but within such a liberal interpretation the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order on the ground that an appropriation for such a purpose is not authorized.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I reoffer the amendment with the word "entertainment" stricken out.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CALDWELL: Page 20, line 20, after the figures and semicolon insert the following: "International Labor Organization \$163,511.64, including not to exceed \$5,901 for the expenses of participation by the United States in the meetings of the general conference and of the governing body of the International Labor Office and in such regional, industrial, or other special meetings as may be duly called by such governing body, including personal services, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, rent, traveling expenses, purchase of books, documents, newspapers, periodicals, and charts, stationery, official cards, printing and binding, hire, maintenance, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and such other expenses as may be necessary."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order with respect to other language in the amendment, such as the words "as may be necessary."

I make the point of order for the further reason that the language "and in such regional, industrial, or other special meetings as may be duly called by such governing body, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, rent, newspapers, and so forth," goes beyond the scope of what is implied in taking membership in an international body. The recitation of all these specific terms is of itself evidence that there is an attempt here to set up authority for certain specific expenses that are not included in the language of the original legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, the gentleman from South Dakota is making too liberal an interpretation of the act, and the Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I send to the desk a further amendment. This takes the place of the language stricken on the point of order made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CALDWELL: On page 18, line 2, after the figures and the semicolon insert the following: "Bureau of Interparliamentary Union for Promotion of International Arbitration, \$20,000, including not to exceed \$10,000 for the expenses of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, traveling expenses, purchase of necessary books, documents, newspapers, periodicals, maps, stationery, official cards, printing and binding, entertainment, and other necessary expenses to be disbursed on vouchers approved by the president and executive secretary of the American group."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the language is still beyond the authorization of the law.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman be specific and point out the language he objects to in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. TABER. The words "and other necessary expenses to be disbursed on vouchers approved by the president and executive secretary of the American group."

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I believe it proper, in view of the scope of the act which authorizes our participation in the Interparliamentary Union, that it be held that all of the purposes now included in the amendment are authorized. Even the word "entertainment," which was complained of in the point of order previously considered, must of necessity be included here.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The act of June 28, 1935, among other things, in the second paragraph has the following language:

Such appropriation to be disbursed on vouchers to be approved by the president and the executive secretary of the American group.

Considering this language in connection with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida, the Chair is constrained to overrule the point of order.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment just offered simply does what has been done for several years by providing the money for the participation by the American group in the Interparliamentary Union.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is unnecessary for me to take more of the time of the Committee in discussing this matter.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that the operations of this Interparliamentary Union do not serve a good purpose. I am satisfied we will get along better in our diplomatic relations with other people if we do not participate in this organization. Some of the members who attended the meeting last summer reported that they left before the proposition was over, and that they felt that the convention might better not have been held. I am satisfied that this kind of a gathering tends to interfere with regular and normal intercourse with respect to foreign affairs with other countries by setting up a group other than the State Department to have charge of our foreign matters. I think such a practice is bad, and I think it ought to be discontinued. I therefore hope the Committee will decide to save \$20,000 and throw this thing out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CALDWELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 47, noes 44.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

WATERWAYS TREATY, UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN: INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN

Salaries and expenses: For salaries and expenses, including salaries of clerks and other employees appointed by the Commissioners on the part of the United States, with the approval solely of the Secretary of State; for necessary traveling expenses, and for expenses incident to holding hearings and conferences at such places in Canada and the United States as shall be determined by the Commission or by the American Commissioners to be necessary, including traveling expense and compensation of necessary witnesses, making necessary transcript of testimony and proceedings; for cost of lawbooks, books of reference and periodicals, office equipment and supplies; and for one-half of all reasonable and necessary joint expenses of the International Joint Commission incurred under the terms of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain concerning the use of boundary waters between the United States and Canada, and for other purposes, signed January 11, 1909; \$19,500, to be disbursed under the direction of the Secretary of State: *Provided*, That the Commissioners on the part of the United States shall serve in that capacity without additional compensation: *Provided further*, That traveling expenses of the American Commissioners, secretary, and necessary employees shall be allowed in accordance with the provisions of the Subsidence Expense Act of 1926, as amended (I. U. S. C. 821-833).

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. CALDWELL: On page 28, line 10, in the parentheses, strike out the letter "I" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "5".

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is merely to correct a typographical error.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries: Secretary of Commerce, Under Secretary of Commerce, Assistant Secretary, and other personal services in the District of Columbia, including the Chief Clerk and Superintendent, who shall be chief executive officer of the Department and who may be designated by the Secretary of Commerce to sign minor routine official papers and documents during the temporary absence of the Secretary, the Under Secretary, and the Assistant Secretary of the Department, \$546,500: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$100,000 of this appropriation shall be available for expenditure by the Secretary of Commerce for personal services of experts and specialists

at rates of compensation not in excess of \$9,000 per annum without regard to the civil-service laws and regulations or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the proviso beginning in line 23, of page 32, and ending in line 3, on page 35, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that the point of order is to the language beginning in line 23, of page 32, beginning with the word "Provided"?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I think the point of order is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CALDWELL: On page 32, beginning in line 23, strike out "\$546,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$384,500."

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, may I say that when the \$100,000 item goes out on a point of order, it follows that the \$60,000 item involved in this paragraph for clerical hire also ought to go out along with it.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Printing and binding: For all printing and binding for the Department of Commerce, including all of its bureaus, offices, institutions, and services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, except the Patent Office and the Bureau of the Census, \$328,000: *Provided*, That an amount not to exceed \$2,000 of this appropriation may be expended for salaries of persons detailed from the Government Printing Office for service as copy editors.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CALDWELL: Page 35, after line 3, insert a separate head as follows:

"BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE"

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing the work of taking, compiling, and publishing the Sixteenth Census of the United States, as authorized by the act of June 18, 1929 (13 U. S. C. 201-218), and the national census of housing as authorized by the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1406), and for carrying on other authorized census work, within a limit of cost for the period of July 1, 1939, to December 31, 1942, of \$53,250,000, including personal services and rentals in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; the cost of transcribing State, municipal, and other records; contracts for the preparation of monographs on census subjects and other work of specialized character which cannot be accomplished through ordinary employment; per diem compensation of employees of the Department of Commerce and other departments and independent establishments of the Government who may be detailed for field work; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the collection of statistics, when incurred on the written authority of the Secretary of Commerce; purchase of books of reference, periodicals, maps, newspapers, manuscripts, first-aid outfits for use in the buildings occupied by employees of the census; maintenance, operation, and repair of a passenger-carrying automobile to be used on official business; construction, purchase, exchange, or rental of punching, tabulating, sorting, and other labor-saving machines, including technical, mechanical, and other services in connection therewith; printing and binding, traveling expenses, streetcar fares, and all other contingent expenses in the District of Columbia and in the field, \$17,850,000, of which \$2,000,000 shall be available immediately, and the unexpended balance of the appropriation under this title in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1940, is hereby continued available until June 30, 1941.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language on page 37, beginning with the word "within", on line 17, running through the word "elsewhere", in line 20. It is legislation on an appropriation bill, increasing the limitation that now exists against the expenses of the Census Bureau, and it is unauthorized by law.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman state the particular language to which he makes the point of order?

Mr. TABER. I shall read it. It is as follows, beginning on line 17, page 37:

Within a limit of cost for the period of July 1, 1939, to December 31, 1942, of \$53,250,000, including personal services and rentals in the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I think the point of order is well taken. It is simply an economy measure that the committee wrote in.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, it is not an economy measure. It raises the authorization \$150,000 beyond all authorizations now existing.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, before that is done, may I propound a parliamentary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CALDWELL. Did I understand the point of order was directed to the language—

Within a limit of cost for the period of July 1, 1939, to December 31, 1942, of \$53,250,000—

The CHAIRMAN. Also the additional language—

including personal services and rentals in the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the matter be reconsidered. I did not hear the reading of the language last referred to. The language "including personal services and rentals in the District of Columbia and elsewhere" is not subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair that might not be so, but the gentleman from New York made the point of order against the entire language, and consequently it is subject to the point of order.

Mr. CALDWELL. Then I desire to propose an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have that privilege after the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York has been disposed of. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 38, line 16, strike out "\$17,850,000" and insert "\$15,684,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is made to save \$2,166,000, which is the cost of the so-called housing census for the fiscal year 1941. That housing census is described in the hearings of the committee on pages 80, 81, 82, and part of 83. A great lot of that matter is duplication. The people of the country are up in arms against this proposal. We are getting letters by the hundreds in our office against this proposition. These census enumerators will want to know whether one has a bathtub or a shower bath, and whether you have running water within the dwelling unit or a hand pump—whether your water supply comes from more than 50 feet from the house or is within 50 feet of the house. They want to know amongst other things whether you have a toilet, whether it is a flush toilet or chemical nonflush toilet or an outside toilet or privy, and whether there is no toilet or privy. They want to know what kind of lights you have. There are about 33 major questions with an (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h) on each one. It is more of a job than the whole census. It is the most ridiculous thing that was ever put up to the American people. The whole cost of this proposition will be \$8,000,000 on top of the regular census cost and it is time that the Congress got together and saved \$8,000,000 of fooling money away to get nowhere. There is hardly an item that might be of any value described in this entire schedule that is not covered by the regular census. We cannot afford to go on with this kind of business. We ought to stop spending in this way, in this ill-considered way, and save a little money.

It is time that we set our heads in the direction of balancing the Budget, instead of running wild and following every scheme that the bureaucrats can evolve to spend money. The census enumerator already has a white sheet a yard long on which he has to ask questions with reference to every member of the household, and he has to give a pretty good description of the house. In addition to this, they propose to give him this proposition with 33 questions and 7 or 8 subdivisions under each of the 33 questions. He will be an hour and a half with each person that he interviews, and we will never get to the end of the annoyance you and I will be put to by our constituents if we allow this outrage to be perpetrated and let them go on and spend \$8,000,000 for that performance.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HARE. Is it the gentleman's purpose to strike out the whole appropriation for the housing census?

Mr. TABER. The whole \$2,166,000 for the housing census.

Mr. HARE. I understood the gentleman to say that the housing census would cost \$8,000,000.

Mr. TABER. It will cost \$8,000,000. That is an estimate before the deficiency committee now for the balance of the \$8,000,000 which they want to spend in the fiscal year 1940, between now and July 1. If we strike out this \$2,166,000, we will probably not have to bother with striking out the other item.

Now let us start in the right direction and get rid of this \$2,166,000 and not fool away money.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say that the figures are \$5,125,000 for the deficiency and \$2,166,000 in this bill, leaving about \$700,000 short of \$8,000,000.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the trouble about the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is that he did not begin soon enough to prevent this appropriation. The latter part of last session an act was passed by this Congress and approved by the President authorizing the taking of the housing census. It is contemplated to take that along in connection with the regular decennial census which is being taken. In other words, in this bill we are appropriating \$2,166,000 for the purpose of taking this census which has been authorized and approved by the Congress. If we do it with the machinery that we have now, we can take the housing census at about one-fourth or one-fifth the cost that would be necessary if we did it independently and had to have a new set-up to take this census.

The principal objection of the gentleman from New York is that it asks too many questions of the party who is being interrogated. I agree with the gentleman that if we had to make up that questionnaire we would not put so many questions in it. We would make it simpler and ask fewer questions. But this proposition is simply to appropriate \$2,166,000 to take this census while we are taking the general Sixteenth Census of this country. Not to do it now, I repeat, would cost us four or five times more than the cost would be if we waited until some other time to take the census.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would like to ask a question for information. This has been bothering me for some time. Do those who are engaged in taking the census come under the Hatch Act or not?

Mr. KERR. Well, I imagine they do. They are employees of the Government. That is simply an opinion of mine.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The Attorney General has sent an opinion to every census supervisor that has been appointed to the effect that it does apply.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HARE. The gentleman and his committee is not responsible for the taking of the housing census?

Mr. KERR. Not at all. The Congress is responsible for it.

Mr. HARE. The only thing the gentleman has done is to provide money which was authorized by the Congress in the last session?

Mr. KERR. Yes, and following the good judgment of those who appeared before us, the paramount reasons are not only to get this information which would enlighten us in the development of our housing program, but now is the proper time to obtain this data through the organization which is now set up and functioning in the Census Bureau.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a matter in which I am deeply interested. I believe there is a very grave misunderstanding in regard to the legislation which was passed last August. You will recall that the housing bill itself was defeated by this Congress. The census-of-housing bill was predicated upon the passage of the housing bill. The necessity for taking this census has already passed. The Census of Housing Act was comparatively simple, and you can find in it nowhere any intent or contemplation on the part of Congress to carry an impertinent inquiry into the private affairs of the homes of this country—30,000,000 homes.

I will say to you that no proposal that has been made in this country within a decade except the court-packing fight has aroused such resistance and opposition as this Housing Census Act has aroused among the American people. They resent this prying and snooping into their private affairs disclosed by the last few questions. Let me enumerate some of them:

VII. For each owner-occupied nonfarm dwelling unit:

In structures without business containing not more than four dwelling units.

28. Market value of this property:

a. Owner-occupant's estimate of the market value of this property.

b. Number of dwelling units included in this value.

29. Is there a mortgage (or land contract) on this property?

Items 30 to 33 need be enumerated only when "Yes" is entered in item 29.

30. Present amount of outstanding indebtedness:

a. On first mortgage or land contract.

b. On second mortgage and other junior liens.

31. Regular payments required on this first mortgage or land contract:

a. Frequency and amount of regular payments, including interest.

(Enter amount in 1, 2, 3, or 4; or "X" in 5 or 6.)

(1) Monthly payments of.

(2) Quarterly payments of.

(3) Semiannual payments of.

(4) Annual payments of.

(5) Other regular-payment plan.

(6) No regular payments required.

b. Do these payments include an amount for reduction of principal?

c. Do these payments include real-estate taxes?

32. What interest rate is now charged on this first mortgage or land contract?

33. Who holds this first mortgage or land contract?

a. Building and loan association.

b. Commercial bank or trust company.

c. Savings bank (mutual or stock).

d. Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

e. Life-insurance company.

f. Mortgage company.

g. Individual.

h. Other.

I have a profound respect for the Census Bureau. It has existed for 150 years. I say to you without fear of any contradiction from any of those men who have been connected with the Census Bureau that they never desired to ask the questions which appear at the latter part of the inquiries which have been sent out, which will be asked by the politically local census enumerators of the head of every household.

The regular officials of the Census Bureau did not want to include the objectionable questions, but from some source somewhere pressure was brought to bear to put in those intimate inquiries, and the people resent them. What is more, citizens are under the threat of jail sentence and fine if they fail to answer these questions and answer them truthfully.

I repeat that never since the Court fight have I been so deluged with mail as I have on this census-of-housing bill. I say to you that for the sake of preserving respect for, and the good name of, the Census Bureau this Congress itself should resist this attempt on the part of some undisclosed influence to use the Census Bureau as a snooping agency under cover of this Census of Housing Act. This House of Representatives is where we shall have to begin to stop this invasion of personal liberty. Of late there has been a tendency on the part of the departments to so construe acts of Congress as to misrepresent to the American people the real intent of Congress. Had there been read to the Congress of the United States the questions set forth in this proposed questionnaire the housing-census bill never would have passed. I hope now that you will strike out this item. Already a resolution, so I am told, has been introduced in the Senate to stop the asking of these obnoxious questions under this census-of-housing bill. Let us do our part to stop it here. I have introduced a bill to repeal this obnoxious legislation which if not repealed will cost \$8,000,000 to accomplish no good purpose, aid no function of government; but which, if administered, will serve only as an irritant to the law-abiding people who still believe they have some rights of privacy in their homes and protection for their intimately personal affairs.

I appeal to you for the preservation of the good name of Congress, for the protection of the good name of the Census Bureau itself, to vote to strike out this item right here and now and help with your votes to eventually repeal the whole Census of Housing Act.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The questions were prepared by the Director of the Census. Why does the gentleman say he was not in favor of them?

Mr. REED of New York. They are assigned to him as author, but he did not prepare them.

The asking of these questions can serve no useful purpose. It should not be carried through. These inquisitorial questions ought never to have been included and never were intended by the framers of the bill.

Mr. KERR. How did they get there if not through the officials who prepared the forms?

Mr. REED of New York. They were prepared by a board. They were ordered to include them. I am talking about the Census Bureau, not about the Department of Commerce.

Mr. KERR. Who ordered the Census Bureau to put them in there?

Mr. REED of New York. I do not know who ordered them; and, of course, I would not ask them to tell. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to excerpts from letters received from all parts of the country protesting against un-American census-of-housing program.

While I have received many protests from men in all walks of life complaining that they must, under penalty of fine or imprisonment, or both, reveal to a local census enumerator the amount of their income and other personal matters never before asked in a census, I shall first quote a few protests from women, for, after all, they have to answer these questions in the great majority of cases. One woman wrote to me as follows:

I, for one—and I believe there will be many, many thousands like me—would be very reluctant to answer these absurd and intimate questions.

Another:

This snooping into private affairs is, plainly putting it, nonsense, and should be stopped.

Another:

This is a free country. Let's keep it that way.

Another:

The New Dealers are certainly taking away our American liberties, and must be curbed now.

Another:

It is unfair for people to have to make all of their affairs public, and we have plenty of taxes now without adding another \$8,000,000 to our present debt.

Another:

I beg of you to do what you can in regard to eliminating that part of the new census bill in which, under penalty of fines and jail sentences, we have to bare our very souls. When our country sinks to this degradation it is a sorry state, indeed.

Another:

Americans are still intelligent; and if the law is not changed, everyone should refuse to answer objectionable questions, taking a fine or jail sentence, if necessary, until we get results.

Another:

I sincerely believe that you have the support of every intelligent citizen of this country in your efforts to have the present census law amended and modified so that our most private affairs will not be subject to the consideration, discussion, and exploitation by any party to whom they are made available.

It is time the American people began to pay attention to what is taking place in our governmental organization before it is put upon an entirely dictatorial basis.

Another:

The April census, as the bill now stands, is an insult to every intelligent man or woman in this community. I have no objections to a Government census as conducted in the past, but I do object to this regimentation this New Deal is forcing on everyone. Before this country is entirely communistic, it is high time we take a stand. I will refuse to answer any personal questions asked by the New Deal snooper.

Another:

I frankly think the Government is stepping on the people's personal rights, and I hope that you will do all within your power to protect these rights for the people whom you represent in Congress.

Another:

You have our hearty commendation for the stand you are taking on the census. More power to you! It is a fine thing when the Government feels it has a right to pry and snoop into the affairs of a private citizen to this extent! We have always regarded it our inalienable right to conduct our affairs without such unwarranted prying, and hope you will continue to do all you can to get this matter rescinded at once. This is surely going too far.

Another:

I do object to local enumerators being given the right to question us in regards to our wages or salary or other domestic affairs of our household.

Another woman:

I object to local enumerators being given the power to do this unnecessary and unwarranted snooping.

Another:

I trust that you will not rest till the whole matter is brought before the people and the party or parties who framed these snooping questions are made known and their names held up to the contempt they deserve.

Another:

We do not care to tell all of our "personal affairs" to some local enumerator. We do not feel it is just to either fine or give us a prison sentence if we do not disclose our affairs to them.

Another:

We Americans will not stand to have our constitutional rights thrown away in this manner. And we will prove what we say next November.

Another:

Do we or don't we as American citizens have some right to our personal affairs? Or is this country of ours becoming one of a dictatorship?

Another:

Many citizens with whom I have talked strenuously disapprove of governmental snooping into their domestic affairs.

Another:

This is supposed to be a free country, but it is far from it if you have got to tell the Government through some local census taker all your personal matters. That's going too far. Stop it, for the sake of all of us.

Another:

It injures my pride in Americanism and my faith in the ability of the leaders of this country to preserve and protect our greatest rights of liberty. I don't like to feel regimented, that I am being treated as they do in foreign countries, where a human being is not an individual any more, but how can I feel otherwise? I was taught the American creed of love, honor, and respect for freedom and liberty that is so typically American. How am I going to teach that to others when someone comes along and takes away the very privacy of my life?

Another:

The insolence of the proposed questions surpasses belief, delving, as they do, into the most intimate phase of home life and financial arrangements of the family.

Another:

It is the most un-American of any ruling yet imposed upon the people by what is supposed to be a democratic government. A very sad fact about this is that few people know about it.

Another:

I think a person should be allowed a few private thoughts and business without advertising it to the community.

Another:

I, being a taxpayer in New York State, am very much opposed to the forthcoming census, being compelled by law to give all of my personal affairs.

Another:

As an American citizen I object to our Government forcing me, under threat of fine or jail term, to disclose my private affairs, even my salary or wages, to a local census enumerator. This country has always been free and we want to keep it free. We do not want a dictator in America.

Another:

It would seem we are no longer a democracy and that our personal liberty is at stake.

Another:

It is an outrageous piece of New Deal totalitarianism. It invades the individual's personal and private rights and that of the family life. I protest against this meddlesome snooping.

Another woman:

It is a snooping campaign that all to whom I have talked are denouncing bitterly. It may not be "search" in the actual fact of invasion of our homes, but it is certainly search of our private affairs, which is just as objectionable to men and women to whom freedom is the breath of life.

Referring to the legal requirement that the census answers be kept confidential, one newspaper editor remarks:

One can only say, "maybe," to that. How did John L. Lewis get confidential coal-cost data, for example?

Another editor said:

The chances are the political hack who pries into your affairs will have a great deal to gossip about. It is too much to expect all of the thousands so hastily recruited will be above that temptation.

Referring to the many letters to the editor, another editorial says:

It can be described, perhaps, as intensified realization that—almost without knowing it—the American people, under the guise of liberal reforms, are being regimented as completely as if they were living under the tightest of dictatorships.

Speaking of dictatorships, here is what one man wrote to me:

Russia and Germany are sure laughing at us. If people are going to land in jail Congress better pass a bill for more Federal jails.

Another man:

Try and repeal this thing, otherwise when the time comes you are going to find the best people in the country in trouble.

Another:

It tastes too much like dictatorship to me,

Another:

My people have fought in every war from the Revolution to the World War, and if this Government is going to take those rights away from us, by dictatorship methods as this census shows, then I and the many people around me who think the same, will have to go back to those methods our forefathers took with England.

A petition:

We, as citizens of a democratic country, feel that that the 1940 census will be a violation of our civil liberties. It promises to be a repulsive snooping into our private lives and affairs, a definite step toward Government regimentation. If the people of Germany and Russia want that sort of thing, let them have it; we don't want it.

Another man:

I am writing you to tell you how bitterly opposed I am to the housing census or this prying and snooping into private affairs. We are coming to dictatorship fast enough unless we all do what we can to prevent it.

A petition:

This is out of place in a free country which is not yet supposed to be ruled by a dictator.

From a man and wife:

If this type of law is allowed to stand we will soon be in a class with Russia—if we are not already there.

From a woman:

Let us have the freedom and rights of Americans.

A man:

I am opposed to the United States of America adopting Russian policies in putting across this census snooping.

From a woman:

It is an outrage that our administration should even contemplate such unfairness, much less to enforce it. What have our forefathers given up their lives for, to adopt Russia's form of liberty?

From a man and wife:

Let them have regimentation in Germany and Russia if that's what they want; we don't want it here.

A FEW PROTESTS FROM MEN

I never heard of or knew that the President, a bureau, the New Deal, or even Congress, could change the United States Constitution. I supposed that had to be done by the people.

Another man:

It seems to me that there is so little of the old American rights left, and from what I can gather this census taking will leave us without a private or sacred thought of our own.

Another:

The majority of American citizens have never failed their Government when necessity arrived, and never will, but the act of spreading before your neighbors all your private business is not a governmental function.

Another:

I have nothing to be ashamed of in my private affairs, but, nevertheless, I feel that when I must tell all—or else—that things have gone way too far. Everyone I have spoken to about this feels the same, except the local enumerator, and he is a ward heeler whom I would not trust to keep the affairs of others confidential.

Another:

I would like to see throughout our country such a storm wave of protests against this recent Government snooping that it will have to be repealed.

Another:

To my layman mind the plan seems an invasion of the liberties guaranteed in spirit by our Bill of Rights. Public distaste for the census as proposed will develop into resentment as enumerators press their questions. The people being questioned will not be cooperative and the resulting information may be incomplete and misleading to a large degree. Under such circumstances data obtained by this census cannot be worth the cost.

Another:

I feel that the Government has no right to pry and snoop into the personal affairs of a private American citizen and that it violates the personal security of the Constitution.

Another man:

This is about the last straw from a bunch of scatterbrained New Deal dictators.

Another:

I resent it very deeply and consider it an encroachment upon the rights of the people of the Nation.

Another:

We think it is an outrage for a local enumerator to be empowered to pry into one's private affairs.

Another:

I, for one, resent what may be a step in taking away our personal liberty.

Another:

I object to our Government forcing us, under threat of fine or imprisonment, to disclose our salary or wages to a local enumerator.

Another:

If the heads of the administration want to become dictators, why can't we ship them all to Europe and let them go to it? Whole communities will go to jail before they will allow this snooping into their business.

Another:

It is more than snooping; it is depriving us of our constitutional rights.

Another:

We have felt the injustices of the Government snooping into everything. It is not for the good of the people that all this information is demanded.

Another:

I do not intend to answer questions which are none of their business.

PETITIONS

Among the petitions which I have received is one signed by 626 out of 700 employees of one company in my district. Following are excerpts from that petition:

In the first place, we do not believe that a resident of this locality should be appointed to snoop into our personal affairs. This would be unbearable, especially in a small community, and a good many would evade correct answers, chancing a fine.

What if we did not pay as much for our home as our next-door neighbor, or have put a mortgage on it for personal reasons—should this information become public gossip?

Another petition bearing 84 names:

We feel that this census is un-American and is only paving the way to future dictatorship.

Another petition bearing 50 names:

We feel that the census as hitherto taken should be sufficient and will back you in any way possible in what you may do to stop these meddling questions.

Another petition, 156 names:

We, as taxpayers and citizens, offer our objections to the enumerators being given the right to question us as to our earnings and other domestic affairs.

A petition of 18:

We wish to express our approval of your efforts to effect repeal of the Special Census Act.

Petition of 15:

We designate you to do all in your power to take such necessary action that will repeal this bill.

Petition of 20 persons:

We object to being forced to disclose our private affairs.

Another petition of 71 signers voices this same objection.

Following are expressions of smaller groups which assembled in homes, stores, and other places:

Those in power in Washington seem to be trying as far as they dare to emulate Hitler and Stalin. This always has been a free and wonderful country, but for some time now it seems that the Government has been usurping more and more authority and has plunged the country into debt so deep it may never find its way out, and they still want to go in deeper.

Words are inadequate to express our feelings of disgust and revolt at the thought of being required to answer questions of so private a nature.

It runs counter to every tradition of our free American lives and violates directly the personal security guaranties of the Constitution itself.

All we ask is consideration and justice. No born American wants to divulge his personal affairs to the public.

A population count is necessary, but when it comes to snooping into all particulars of one's personal affairs it is most emphatically resented.

The Daughters of Union Veterans of one town wrote:

We feel that our Grand Old Army fought for freedom and we aim to maintain that blessed freedom they obtained, so kindly do what you can to repeal the special census of housing supposed to begin on April 1.

From Veterans of Foreign Wars, Tezzi-Reitz Post, No. 250, Philadelphia, Pa.:

I brought before the members of the above-captioned post the snooping attitude and the un-American methods of prying into the personal affairs of the citizens of this country by a group of political hacks who may use the information obtained for a mercenary cause and which might cause considerable embarrassment to many of our citizens. The members of this post agree with you that the present bill should be repealed and will give you whole-hearted support in your efforts to have it changed.

From an American Legion auxiliary:

The Legion auxiliary of the George Harbel Post want to join in protesting the housing census.

From a teacher of sociology in a monastery:

Laissez faire was a bad feature of individualism but national social planning can also be carried too far. Yea, even to the extent of being snoopy. And so I wish to add my voice to you in protest against certain practices of the National Census Bureau of 1940.

From a minister:

I desire to express my appreciation of your action in introducing a bill in the House concerning unnecessary and inquisitive questions in the forthcoming census.

From the head of a parochial school:

It is our sincere prayer that your bill to repeal the housing census may meet with the approval of every true American.

From a Sunday-school class—20 signers:

We vigorously object to this so-called government snooping census. As a free people we object to being regimented.

From a school faculty:

We congratulate you for position taken on census matter.

A college professor:

It looks to me as if the census is to be used as a means of getting information concerning the financial affairs of citizens which would be used as a basis for a capital levy if the present administration is retained in power or one like it elected. At the very least it will be used as a means of imposing additional local taxation upon citizens.

From a store owner:

I am just a small-store owner, but as another American, I refuse to answer the questions put to me by some political appointee.

A physician:

We do not approve of the personal clause in the census.

A businessman:

Public opinion, as I have heard it expressed in no uncertain terms, is decidedly against the personal-affairs phase of the census.

A surgeon:

I know of nothing that enrages an American any more than to have some young upstart come poking into your home to ask you how many bathrooms you have, how many windows you have, what kind of rugs on the floor, what make of kitchen stove, and a thousand other senseless questions.

An oil producer:

It seems to me that no one will seriously object to furnishing the enumerators with any kind of useful or necessary statistical information, but when it comes to incomes, etc., then it becomes just as objectionable as a previous law to make income-tax returns public documents and which, due to an aroused public sentiment, had to be thrown out the window. This is especially objectionable in view of the fact that the enumerators are, I understand, to be local residents.

A lawyer:

This is certainly a crazy scheme to spend a lot more of the people's money.

A farmer:

Let me commend you highly for introducing a bill to allow us to maintain some of the liberties to which we were once accustomed. I had made up my mind to let the census taker guess on some of the questions and have not changed it yet.

Officers and employees of a corporation:

While we agree that there is certain information to which the Government is justly entitled and should have free access to this information, there is other information requested in this new census which smacks of totalitarianism and deprives us of the privacy to which we are justly entitled.

A businessman:

We not only think this will impose on what are our own personal affairs but also a big waste of money.

President of a metal company:

The administration pretends to admire Thomas Jefferson, but acts the opposite way. It forgets that in the Declaration of Independence he put something like this: "He (King George III) has erected a multitude of new offices and sent among us swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance." It does exactly the same things.

President of a bank:

One of our women customers, who has a savings account, was in yesterday and appeared to be concerned lest the census taker would be asking how much she had in the bank, and if that question was required to be asked she proposed to draw her money out until after the census was taken.

It seems to be very unfortunate that the census could not have been taken in the usual fair and dignified manner.

Officers and employees of a bank, 29 signers:

There is a great deal of sentiment here in opposition to the questions of a very personal nature, answers to which, we understand, will be required.

A businessman:

I consider this census an invasion of my personal rights, and as a taxpayer to the extent of over \$3,000 a year want to say that the millions spent in this project are a waste of money which could be used to far better advantage than to increase our already huge debt.

Another businessman:

I regard it as the duty of every American citizen to work toward the abolition of this attempt to regiment the country, and if this is not a free country I would certainly appreciate knowing it. I have numerous acquaintances who have expressed themselves as decidedly against the census in the form that it is proposed to take. We all consider this inquisitorial idea a distinct violation of our rights as American citizens and intend to resist such encroachment vigorously.

Another:

This new New Deal act is another step toward Hitlerism and, if not stopped, will lead to further aggressions on our personal liberties.

Another:

We think it is a disgrace and an insult to be subjected to such a humiliation as the census-taking law. Just what can we expect next? We—and I speak for a good many people in our community—simply cannot tolerate such an infringement on our freedom, or aren't we supposed to have it any more?

Another:

This census is an outrage on the people and, of course, the questions have been added by someone wanting to have an authority over the rights of the people.

Another:

For the last 8 years I have been trying to operate a small business. To put a climax on the rapidly increasing taxes, reports, etc., we now find that the Government is even going deeper into our personal affairs in taking the 1940 census. The sentiment toward the 1940 census is universal. There will be some well-filled jails. At least, the Government will have to take care of us for a change.

A real-estate broker:

We feel this is most un-American and one of the first steps toward regimentation—a system which many European countries suffer under at the present time. We find nothing contrary to this feeling in talking with the people of this section and feel that this is the general attitude of the community.

From the owner of a granite company:

I really didn't think that the new dealers would dare set aside what's left of the people's constitutional rights, but after draining our Treasury they have become snoopers with plans, no doubt, to drain the individual's pocket.

From a dentist:

I believe everyone in your district would appreciate it if you would do all in your power to have the census questions revised so as to eliminate a lot of the objectionable features. I need not go into any detail about this, as anybody who is informed on the matter knows that the procedure is outrageous.

From a farmer's wife:

In 5 years my taxes for schools were raised from \$12.49 to \$22.18, my State and county taxes from \$18 to \$31.18. So, if they send these people around, there will be that much more. If they want money, why not get out with a pick and shovel and earn it.

From a man and wife:

We have been acting as adults for too many years to feel that we need a paternal Government to look into our affairs in such detail as this census proposes to do.

Self-respect is still one of the fundamentals that will save the American form of government if people are not forced to lose it.

Another:

We have no objections to a population census, but believe that the \$8,000,000 could be used to better advantage by a Government already deep in the red.

Another:

The new census is one of the most discreditable steps ever taken by a democratic government. It is unbelievable.

Another:

We are opposed to this special census and the accompanying expense. Let's not pass the debt on to the next fellow but assume our full share in an economy that will reduce the load.

Mr. Chairman, these protests come from law-abiding American citizens and their views are worthy of the attention of their Representatives.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there are probably several good reasons why this \$2,000,000 ought not to be allowed, but all of these reasons existed less than a year ago when this act passed the House without a record vote.

It is rather amusing to see the Committee on Appropriations criticized on the one hand because they refuse to allow items to carry out the purposes of legislation approved by the Congress and on the other to be criticized for allowing funds to effectuate the purposes of such acts.

The real reason behind the opposition to this is quite natural and one we can understand—a political reason. I do not believe you need go very deeply to find what prompts the motion.

The wisdom of whether or not these housing questions should be asked is one which was decided by the Advisory Committee on the Census. I think the information sought will probably serve a useful purpose, but whether this be so or not the machinery has been set up, the forms have been printed, the census officials have been instructed to secure the data. I feel this is not the time to stop the appropriation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. I yield.

Mr. TABER. The Director of the Census has said that not a single step has been taken, outside of the Census Bureau's getting these blanks together, to go ahead and spend money on this thing.

Mr. CALDWELL. And I may say to the gentleman from New York that I think the Director of the Census is in error, because in the State of Florida I have seen forms relating to this particular census, and the officials of the census have their instructions.

Mr. TABER. Then the gentleman did not tell us the story when he was in front of us? Is that it?

Mr. CALDWELL. The gentleman may draw his own conclusion.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to page 79 of the hearings. This reviews the situation. I read this portion of the hearings to you:

Let us review first the history of the Housing Census Act. It originated in the Senate at the last session of Congress, after considerable urging by Senator WAGNER and others for legislation which would permit the Bureau of the Census to take a census of housing.

In a bill which was prepared several years ago, but was not presented for enactment by the administration, the subject of housing was added by the Federal Government to the subjects to be taken in the decennial census by the Census Bureau. At that time it received the approval of the administration and the Bureau of the Budget.

Senator WAGNER introduced the present legislation April 5, 1939 (S. 2240, 76th Cong.). The Committee on Banking and Currency, to which it was referred, reported favorably, and it passed the Senate on June 23. The Census Committee reported it with amendments on July 26, and the Rules Committee recommended a special rule (H. Res. 281) on July 29. Both the rule and the bill were debated in the House on August 4, and the bill passed by a vote of 191 to 145.

The housing statistics which will be obtained under this authorization are needed both by the Government and by business. Such a census has been taken by the principal European countries for many years. England took her first census of housing in 1802, and has compiled very valuable and useful statistics.

We feel that it is a proper function of the Department of Commerce to gather these statistics for the use of other departments, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Federal Housing Administration, the United States Housing Authority, and other governmental agencies interested in housing.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CALDWELL) there were—ayes 54, noes 52.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. CALDWELL and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 59, noes 72.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read down to line 10, page 52.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. RAYBURN, having resumed the chair, Mr. BEAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8319) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Commerce, and Justice, and for the judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their own remarks on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CALDWELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain census questions together with a few excerpts from letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article on the improved employment conditions in Connecticut.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Washington Evening Star and a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution adopted at a meeting in Chicago protesting against certain operations in Poland and in Czechoslovakia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKEOUGH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech made by the junior Senator from Virginia, HARRY BYRD, at the laying of the keel of the U. S. S. *Alabama*.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DARDEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech made over the N. B. C. last evening by the Honorable Leon C. Phillips, Governor of Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN]?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 628)

The Chair laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Secretary of State and the accompanying draft of proposed legislation to amend section 26 (e) of the act of February 23, 1931, as amended by the act of April 24, 1939, the purpose of which is to insert additional language which has been found, in administering the aforesaid section 26 (e) as now established, to be necessary in order to carry out fully the purposes of this law.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 7, 1940.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, over a period of some little time the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], has been contributing articles to Liberty magazine. During a period when there is no committee in existence he, of course, has a perfect right to write articles or to say anything that he pleases, as has every other American citizen. I suppose all of us have that right as a general matter, but no member of this committee can dissociate himself from the committee in the public mind. At the present time, moreover,

the committee is functioning, and one of the things that it has been stated the committee would undertake is an investigation of matters on the west coast and in California.

I will be glad to get to the bottom of any difficulties that there may be in my own State as well as in any other State, but in the current issue of *Liberty* magazine is an article written by the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities with reference to the situation in California. The committee very properly, I think, did not make public the report of the investigators on the west-coast matters for the reason that no hearings had yet been held regarding them. I do not propose to address myself to the substance of that article or to what is stated therein, but it appears to me that inevitably the very appearance of such an article and the expressions in that article of the chairman's point of view as to what he thinks about the situation puts the investigation in an extremely difficult situation, and makes it very hard for the course of the investigation not to be colored by opinions and statements already made and matter more or less of record.

There is at issue here the whole question of proper conduct of an investigation and therefore of the work of the committee, about which I have spoken before. It seems to me the job of the committee is to take evidence, establish facts in its hearings and through its investigation, and thereafter make a report. The time for appraisals of any situation seems to me to be after, not before, all the evidence and testimony are in. I would not be true to my own convictions about this matter if I did not protest what has happened.

[Here the gavel fell.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. NORTON, for 2 weeks, on account of illness.

To Mr. BLOOM (at the request of Mr. Izac), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. MITCHELL, for 4 days, on account of illness in family.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore:

H. R. 8067. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes.

The Speaker pro tempore announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1157. An act for the relief of Roy D. Cook, a minor.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 8, 1940, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting on Thursday, February 8, 1940, at 10 a. m., before the Petroleum Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. State regulatory bodies will be heard first.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on the following dates on the matters named:

Tuesday, February 13, 1940:

H. R. 1780, to amend section 7 of the act of June 19, 1886, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., Supp. III, title 46, sec. 319), relative to penalties on certain undocumented vessels and cargoes engaging in the coastwise trade or the fisheries, and for other purposes.

H. R. 5837, to amend section 221 of the Shipping Act, barring certain aliens from participating in the benefits thereof.

H. R. 6770, to amend Revised Statutes 4311 (U. S. C. 251).

H. R. 7694, to amend section 4311 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

H. R. 8180, to require that not less than 75 percent of the crew of any fishing vessel of the United States be citizens of the United States.

Tuesday, February 20, 1940:

H. R. 4079, to amend sections 4353 and 4355 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

H. R. 6751, to repeal certain laws with respect to manifests and vessel permits.

H. R. 5788, to amend the present law relating to the delivery of ships' manifests to collector of customs by excluding Sundays and holidays from the time within which such delivery may be made by the master.

H. R. 5789, to amend the present law relating to the delivery of ships' manifests to collectors of customs by excluding Sundays and holidays from the time within which such delivery may be made by the master.

Friday, February 23, 1940:

H. R. 7639, to provide for the examination of civilian nautical schools and for the inspection of vessels used in connection therewith, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Wednesday, February 14, 1940, at 10 a. m., there will be a hearing before the Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary on the bill (H. R. 8016) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto (municipal compositions). The hearing will be held in room 346, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

Beginning Tuesday, February 27, 1940, the Committee on the Census will hold hearings on the reapportionment of Representatives in Congress.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7926. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 1577). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. S. 1088. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to exchange certain property located at Veterans' Administration facility, Tuskegee, Ala., title to which is now vested in the United States, for certain property of the Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute; without amendment (Rept. No. 1578). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. S. 2866. An act to provide for allowance of expenses incurred by Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants in authorized travel for examination and treatment; without amendment (Rept. No. 1579). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VAN ZANDT: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. S. 2867. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., for right-of-way purposes, a small strip of land at Veterans' Administration facility, Coatesville, Pa.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1580). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8340) for the relief of Eugene E. Lee; and the same was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 8348. A bill to maintain farm homes in the United States and provide power to consume goods and provide opportunity for the employment of the idle, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 8349. A bill to amend section 272 of the Judicial Code (28 U. S. C., par. 394) in relation to forbidding corporations and voluntary associations from practicing law before courts, quasi judicial or administrative bodies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROMJUE:

H. R. 8350. A bill permitting official mail of the Pan American Sanitary Bureau to be transmitted in penalty envelopes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 8351. A bill authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 8352. A bill adding section 41-A to the judicial code concerning the importation, transportation, and disposition of property acquired through confiscatory decrees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 8353. A bill to change the designation of the Fort Marion National Monument, in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PIERCE:

H. R. 8354. A bill to provide for complaint, assistance to farmers, and intervention by the Secretary of Agriculture in proceedings before the United States Maritime Commission relating to the transportation of farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 8355 (by request). A bill to provide greater uniformity of entitlement to, and adjudication of, certain benefits for certain classification of veterans, and their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 8356. A bill for the exchange of lands adjacent to the San Juan National Forest and the Rio Grande National Forest in Colorado; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KELLER:

H. R. 8357. A bill to amend the act entitled "Mount Rushmore Memorial Act of 1938"; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. O'LEARY:

H. R. 8358. A bill for the protection of the American merchant marine, and other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LUCE:

H. J. Res. 448. Joint resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure an oil portrait of Charles Moore; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. J. Res. 449. Joint resolution for the relief of the anguished, stricken, and starving population of war-torn and martyred Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Res. 379. Resolution authorizing the printing of the Rules and Manual of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred to as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 8359. A bill for the relief of Thomas Martin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 8360. A bill granting a pension to Cuthbert W. Chesterfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLUETT:

H. R. 8361. A bill granting an increase of pension to Georgiana Stevens; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS:

H. R. 8362. A bill for the relief of Istvan Gyergyai; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 8363. A bill for the relief of Eugene Miller; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia:

H. R. 8364. A bill for the relief of Glenn Richard Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURDOCK of Utah:

H. R. 8365. A bill for the relief of Cooley Memorial Hospital, Murland W. Fish, M. D., Juanita B. Stone, and May Jeppson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 8366. A bill granting a pension to Katherine Mueller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6405. By Mr. ANDREWS: Resolution adopted by the Polish Relief Committee of Niagara Falls, N. Y., and resolution from the St. Francis Society branch of Polish Union of America, of Niagara Falls, N. Y., favoring House Joint Resolution 412; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6406. By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan: Petition of Oscar J. Weisler, of East Jordan; Jake Klvester, of Ellsworth; and sundry others of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6407. By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: Petition of sundry citizens of Kewanee, Ill., urging that shipment of war materials to Japan be stopped; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6408. By Mr. COLLINS: Concurrent resolution submitted by the Mississippi State Legislature, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide a way by which the counties of the State of Mississippi may be reimbursed by the Federal Government for losses of revenue because of Government-owned lands having been withdrawn from tax liability; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

6409. By Mr. HOUSTON: Petition of 57 residents of Wichita, Kans., and vicinity, urging enactment of the Patman chain-store tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6410. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Petition of the Brooklyn Concourse Association of Homing Pigeon Flyers, Middle Village, Long Island, N. Y., urging support of House bill 7813, a bill to guarantee protection to the valuable homing pigeon against hunters, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6411. Also, petition of the National Federation of Federal Employees, Washington, D. C., concerning House bill 960; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

6412. Also, petition of the Society of American Foresters, Oneonta, N. Y., urging increased Federal appropriation for the control of white-pine blister rust; also expressing opposition to the proposed transfer of the administration of the

national forests to the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6413. Also, petition of Mary R. Dorsett and others, of New York City, urging support of the referendum before conscription for foreign wars; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6414. Also, petition of the Air Line Pilots Association, Chicago, Ill., urging passage of Senate bill 2735, providing for the issuance of pilot's license No. 1 to Orville Wright; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6415. Also, petition of the Pacific Northwest Business Association, Seattle, Wash., urging support of the four-point plan of Admiral Yarnell of the United States Navy (retired) for the settlement of the Far East situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6416. Also, petition of the Bureau of Transportation and Public Service of the New Bedford Board of Commerce, New Bedford, Mass., urging support of House Resolution 360, providing for an investigation of the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes Deep Waterway; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6417. Also, petition of the Michigan Alkali Co., Detroit, Mich., urging support of House Resolution 360, providing for an investigation of the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes Deep Waterway; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6418. Also, petition of the Valdez Chamber of Commerce, Valdez, Alaska, concerning the report of Harry J. Slattery, Under Secretary, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

6419. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the National Federation of Federal Employees, Washington, D. C., favoring the passage of House bill 960; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

6420. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Empire State Automobile Merchants Association, Inc., Albany, N. Y., concerning the Wagner National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

6421. Also, petition of the National Federation of Federal Employees, favoring the passage of House bill 960, the Ramspeck bill; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

6422. By Mr. RANKIN: Petition of the Legislature of Mississippi; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6423. By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Concurrent resolution introduced and adopted by the House of Assembly and concurred in by the Senate of the State of New Jersey, January 15, 1940, memorializing the House of Representatives to continue the Dies committee investigating un-American practices, feeling that the work of this committee is vitally important to the protection and perpetuation of the spirit of true American patriotism; to the Committee on Rules.

6424. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution passed by the Water Project Authority of the State of California, setting forth the necessity for, and urging an increase in, the appropriation for Central Valley project for the next fiscal year; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6425. Also, resolution passed by the Board of Supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco, requesting support of the California delegation in making available essential appropriation to effect early culmination of Central Valley project; to the Committee on Appropriations.